

JOHN THE EXARCH AND HIS SOURCES: NEW SOURCES OF THE SIXTH BOOK OF THE *ŠESTODNEV*

Lara SELS – Ghent University (UGent)

In the sixth book of his *Šestodnev*¹ John the Exarch (second half 9th century – first half 10th century) mentions a certain Gregory, who is called “a true brother of the Great Basil”. Without a doubt John is referring to Gregory of Nyssa (ca.331/340–ca.394), one of the three Cappadocian fathers and brother of Basil of Caesarea. The reason for John’s mentioning the bishop of Nyssa is obvious: he refers to one of the sources of the last book of his *Šestodnev*, which deals with the Creation of Man, viz. Gregory of Nyssa’s anthropological treatise *De hominis opificio* (CPG 3154).² The importance of this treatise as a source for John’s hexaemeral work – a source which was, however, suspected of containing heretical elements – has remained unnoticed up to the present moment.

1. In search of the sources

Some years after the publication of Rudolf Aitzetmüller’s scholarly edition of the complete text of the *Šestodnev* (seven vols.; 1958-1975),³ Ivan Dujčev wrote:

¹ Written in the first period of Symeon’s rule, viz. before 917/18, cf. I. DUJČEV, “Zur Biographie von Johannes dem Exarchen”, *Litterae slavicae medii aevi: Francisco Venceslao Mareš Sexagenario Oblatae*. Ed. J. Reinhart. München 1985: 67-72, esp. 69.

² MIGNE, *Patrologia Graeca* – hereafter quoted as PG – 44: 123-256. The most trustworthy edition to this day remains G.H. FORBES, “De conditione hominis”, in his: *Sancti patris nostri Gregorii Nysseni Basilii Magni fratris quae supersunt omnia*. T.1, fasc. 1-2. Burntisland 1855: 96-319.

³ R. AITZETMÜLLER, *Das Hexaëmeron des Exarchen Johannes*. Bd I-VII. Graz 1958-1975. This replaces the diplomatic edition of MS Synodal 345 (1263), published in 1879 by O. Bodjanskij – *Шестоднев составленный Иоанном Экзархом Болгарским. По харазейному списку Московской Синодальной библиотеки 1263 года*. As is known, Aitzetmüller used Bodjanskij’s work for the reproduction of Synodal 345. For some remarks concerning the insufficiency of Bodjanskij’s edition, see e.g. A. LESKIEN, “Zum Šestodnev des Exarchen Johannes”, *Archiv für Slavische Philologie* 26 (1904): 1-4. An edition of the early Russian redaction of the *Šestodnev* has been published by Г.С. БАРАНКОВА, *Шестоднев Иоанна Екзарха Болгарского. Ранняя Русская редакция*. Москва 1998; also EADEM & В. МИЛЬКОВ, *Шестоднев Иоанна Екзарха Болгарского*. Санкт-Петербург 2001.

Le *Hexaëmeron* de Jean l'Exarque n'est, strictement parlant, qu'une compilation parfois assez libre, relevant de sources premières de l'époque patristique grecque. Pour mieux comprendre le texte paléobulgare, il est absolument nécessaire de tenir compte des textes grecs utilisés. Ajoutons tout de suite la difficulté fondamentale: établir avec précision ces textes patristique que l'auteur paléobulgare avait dans les mains.⁴

Although scholarship, especially subsequent to Aitzetmüller's edition, has shown ample attention to the Exarch's exegetical *magnum opus* – without a doubt one of the major achievements of Old Slavonic literature at the time of Symeon – few publications have been dedicated to the problem of the Byzantine sources. As is known, the *Šestodnev* contains some clues for the identification of the source texts: the Exarch himself points to the “*Hexaemeron* of St. Basil” – that is, Basil of Caesarea's *Homiliae IX in Hexaemeron* (CPG 2835)⁵ – as his main source.⁶

A first period of research into the sources of the *Šestodnev* – already set in with the work of Konstantin Kalajdović (1792-1832)⁷ and Aleksandr Gorskij (1812-1875) and Kapiton Nevostruev (1815-1872)⁸ – was concluded with Aitzetmüller's edition, which contains the Greek parallels for the identified sections of the *Šestodnev*. Besides long passages from the already mentioned *Homiliae in Hexaemeron* by Basil of Caesarea, the fragments are from Severian of Gabala's *In cosmogoniam orationes VI* (CPG 4194),⁹ and, for the first book of the *Šestodnev*, from Theodoret of Cyrus's *Graecarum affectionum curatio* (CPG 6210).¹⁰ References to smaller excerpts from primary or secondary sources – a.o. Plato, Aristotle, Gregory of Nazianzus, John Damascene, and Sextus Empiricus – can be found in Aitzetmüller's *apparatus criticus*.

⁴ I. DUJČEV, “L'Hexaëmeron de Jean l'Exarque”, *Byzantino-Slavica* 39 (1978): 211.

⁵ Ed. PG 29: 4-208; S. GIET, *Basile de Césarée. Homélie sur l'Hexaéméron*. Paris 1949 (= *Sources Chrétiennes* 26); E. AMAND DE MENDIETA & S.Y. RUDBERG, *Basilus von Caesarea Homilien zum Hexaemeron*. Berlin 1997 (= *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte*. Neue Folge – Bd 2).

⁶ Cf. AITZETMÜLLER, *Hexaëmeron*, Bd. I. Graz 1958: 43-44 (6b): “сн же словеса шесть не о себѣ мзи исмъ съставнан, нъ ово отъ некъсamera сватааго вачанна истоваа словеса, ово же н разоумъ отъ него въземающе; такожде н отъ Иоанна, а другоге отъ другыиныхъ...”; the reference to a certain John (Ioann) is less unequivocal; the name has been connected with John Chrysostom as well as with John Damascene. A later scribe rightly added the names of Severian (viz. of Gabala) and Aristotle to this passage.

⁷ In his groundbreaking work *Иоанн экзарх Болгарский* (Moscow 1824); see G.A. IL'ISKIJ, “Jean l'Exarch. À propos du livre de Kalajdović (1824-1924)”, *Revue des Études Slaves* 4 (1924): 199-207, esp. 203.

⁸ See A.B. ГОРСКИЙ & К.И. НЕВОСТРУЕВ, *Описание славянских рукописей Московской синодальной библиотеки* 2,1. Москва 1857: 1-43, esp. 11 et seq.

⁹ Ed. PG 56: 429-500; for Severian's homilies see J. ZELLINGER, *Die Genesishomilien des Bischofs Severian von Gabala*. Münster 1916 (= *Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen* VII,1).

¹⁰ Ed. PG 83: 897-924; the excerpt is from IV. *De materia et mundo*: 916 et seq.; also P. CANIVET, *Théodoret de Cyr – Thérapeutique des maladies helléniques*. t.I. Livres I-VI. Paris 1958 (= *Sources chrétiennes* 57/1).

Furthermore the *Šestodnev* contains large passages that have not as yet been traced to particular Greek parallel texts.¹¹ Apparently most of these passages are not so much translations as free paraphrases from various sources:

Wo aber bisher kein zusammenhängender griechischer Paralleltext gefunden wurde, stellt Ioanns 'eigene' Exegese eine freie Paraphrasierung (von Bibel und Vätern) zum jeweiligen Thema dar, die teilweise dem Aufbau der Basileios-Homilien folgt, daneben aber auch andere Kirchenväter wie Gregorios von Nazianz, Gregorios von Nyssa, Johannes von Damaskos (Ekthesis/Bogoslovie), (Ps.-)Dionysios (Areopagites?) und vor allem Aristoteles mit seinen naturphilosophischen Schriften heranzieht.¹²

However, a detailed analysis of John the Exarch's line of reasoning may occasionally reveal his primary and secondary sources, as is the case with a large passage from book VI of the *Šestodnev*. This book – without a doubt a vital part of the work – deals with the creation of Man. The book opens with the famous description of the court in Preslav (VI, 1-6; 205c-206a)¹³ – an original element, undoubtedly to be ascribed to the Exarch himself. This is followed by a lengthy and largely unidentified section (VI, 6-274; 206a-239c). One particular passage has received considerable scholarly attention, viz. the medical exposition of the human physiology (VI, 171-240; 226d-235b), which indirectly goes back to the first book of Aristotle's *Historia Animalium*.¹⁴ Leskien's source-critical analysis of this fragment has revealed parallels also with Meletius the Monk's *Tractatus de natura hominis*.¹⁵ The Aristotelian passage is followed by a fragment which comments on the symbolism of the numbers in the creation narrative (VI, 263-274; 238b-239c).¹⁶ Furthermore, the sixth book contains a translation of the larger part of Basil's ninth homily in *Hexaemeron*

¹¹ AITZETMÜLLER, *Hexaëmeron* I, 1-6 (1a-c); 43-48 (6b-d); 145-212 (19a-27b); II, 7-18 (36a-37b); 97-215; III, 7-142 (73c-89a); IV 1-264 (110a-142d); V, 1-32 (170a-173d); VI, 1-274 (205c-239c).

¹² G. PODSKALSKY, *Theologische Literatur des Mittelalters in Bulgarien und Serbien 865-1459*. München 2000: 230.

¹³ References are made on the basis of Aitzetmüller's edition.

¹⁴ See ГОРСКИЙ & НЕВОСТРУЕВ, *Описание* 2.1: 17 et seq.; also the long article by Ю. ТРИФОНОВ, "Иоан Екзарх Български и неговото описание на човешкото тело", *Български преглед* 1 (1929), кн. 2: 165-202, esp. 182-202 (the Aristotelian fragment and a Bulgarian translation are on p. 187-202).

¹⁵ LESKIEN, A., "Der aristotelische Abschnitt im Hexaemeron des Exarchen Johannes", *Jagič-Festschrift. Zbornik u slavu Vatroslava Jagića*. Berlin 1908: 97-111; for the *Tractatus de natura hominis* – ed. PG 64: 1076-1309 – see K. KRUMBACHER *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur: von Justinian bis zum Ende des Oströmischen Reiches (527-1453)*. New York 1958 (München 1897): 617(7); cf. CPG 3550: "Liber de natura hominis Meletii monachi apographon est libri Nemesii" – viz. the *De natura hominis* of Nemesius of Emessa.

¹⁶ Viz. on the six days of the creation, God's rest on the seventh day, and the eighth day of resurrection and new life. For the treatment of the symbolism of the eighth day by the Byzantine Fathers, see G. PODSKALSKY, "Ruhestand oder Vollendung? Zur Symbolik des achten Tages in der griechisch-byzantinischen Theologie", *Fest und Alltag in Byzanz*, ed. G. Prinzing & D. Simon. München 1990: 157-166, 216-219.

(VI, 273-352; 239c-249b), and ends with Severian of Gabala's fourth homily *in cosmogoniam orationes* (VI, 352-494; 249b-267a). Ivan Dujčev considered the first, unidentified part of book VI to be a 'more or less original' creation of John:

Pour toute la première partie du livre de l'*Hexaémeron*, consacrée au sixième jour de la Création [...], c'est-à-dire pour le texte aux pages 1-273, on n'est pas en état d'indiquer un texte grec correspondant. Il faut donc supposer qu'il s'agit d'une œuvre plus ou moins originale de l'auteur paléobulgare.¹⁷

However, this does not exclude the possibility of John's drawing upon particular patristic sources. In fact, his dependence on Gregory of Nyssa's anthropological treatise *De hominis opificio* can be clearly demonstrated.

2. Gregory of Nyssa as a source for book VI of the *Šestodnev*

The point of departure for the present source-critical analysis of book VI is a study concerning the Greek manuscript tradition of Basil's *Homiliae in Hexaemeron*. It is shown that, in many cases, the Genesis commentaries of both brothers – viz. Basil's homilies and Gregory's *De hominis opificio* – have been handed down together in a variable body of texts, the so-called 'Hexaemeron-corpus'.¹⁸ It must be noted that the creation of Man has not been dealt with in Basil's homilies, while exactly this subject is discussed in book VI of John's *Šestodnev*.¹⁹ It was Basil's brother, Gregory, who filled this void with his *De hominis opificio*.²⁰ Moreover, it is known that the Exarch was acquainted with Gregory's treatise: he translated three chapters of it as appendices to his *Bogoslovie*, a selective translation of John Damascene's *De fide orthodoxa*.²¹

¹⁷ DUJČEV, *L'Hexaémeron*: 220-221.

¹⁸ For the Greek tradition see AMAND DE MENDIETA, E. & S.Y. RUDBERG, *Basile de Césarée. La tradition manuscrite directe des neuf homélies sur l'Hexaéméron. Étude philologique* (= *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*. Bd. 123). Berlin 1980; for the implications for the Slav tradition see Л. СЕЛС (= L. SELS), "Славянский 'Корпус Гексамерона': Перевод 14-го века и Иоанн Экзарх Болгарский", *Проблеми на Кирило-Методиевото дело и на Българска култура през XIV век*. София 2007 (= *Кирило-Методиевски студии* 17): 619-626.

¹⁹ Basil's ninth homily deals with the creation of the terrestrial animals; the creation of Man is only briefly touched upon – cf. AITZETMÜLLER, *Hexaëmeron* VI, 341-352 (248a-249b).

²⁰ In his last homily, the elder Cappadocian writes: "Ἐν τίνι μὲν οὖν ἔχει τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα Θεοῦ ὁ ἄνθρωπος, καὶ πῶς μεταλαμβάνει τοῦ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν, ἐν τοῖς ἐφεξῆς, Θεοῦ διδόντος, εἰρήσεται." (AMAND DE MENDIETA & RUDBERG, *Basilios von Caesarea*. Hom. IX: 160); eventually this would be done by Gregory. Some scholars, however, accept that Basil completed the work himself, namely with the two homilies *De creatione hominis* (cf. *infra* note 50).

²¹ The appendices have been published by Linda SADNIK, "Die Bruchstücke aus Väterschriften im Anschluß an die Übersetzung der"Εκθεσις ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως

However, the most convincing argument to consider the possibility of John's drawing upon the *De hominis opificio* is the already mentioned reference to Gregory's name.

The point of departure for John's anthropological expositions in the unidentified part of book VI is the quotation from Genesis "And God said, 'Let Us make man in Our image, after Our likeness'" (1:26). The text deals with the privileged status of Man, who, being made in image of God, surpasses the animals and the rest of the creation in dignity. John emphasizes the fact that Man is a rational being, who can decide autonomously through his free will. On the one hand he rules over creation, while and on the other he remains an earthly being created from dust. In this section John allows for a lengthy exposition on the creation and the nature of the human soul.

The fact that one can find numerous general parallels with Gregory's *De hominis opificio* in this section of book VI could easily be explained on account of the common thematic. The treatment of the Genesis account unfolds partly along traditional lines and similar arguments recur in the writings of other patristic authors. However, there are significant parallels which cannot be ignored. The aim of this article is not to give attention to all passages where the influence of the *De hominis opificio* can be suspected, but to firmly establish John's dependence on Gregory's treatise in the first place. This will be done in the subsequent pages, by means of an analysis of the most striking example, namely the Exarch's exposition on the sequence of the creation of the human body and soul (VI, 85-150; 216a-224a).

3. The Creation of Body and Soul

The matter of the creation of body and soul is treated extensively in two chapters from Gregory of Nyssa's *De hominis opificio*,²² namely chapter 28: *To those who say that souls existed before bodies, or that bodies were formed before souls; wherein is also a refutation of the fables concerning transmigration of souls*, and 29: *An establishment of the doctrine that the cause of the existence of soul and body is one and the same*.²³ In these chapters

des Exarchen Johannes", *Anzeiger für slavische Philologie* 9 (1977), 2: 429-444; 10-11 (1979): 163-187; 12 (1981): 133-169.

²² Because Forbes' edition *De conditione hominis* (1855) is not readily found, the Greek text of these two chapters are added in an appendix. The page numbers in Forbes' edition are indicated in brackets; the arrangement in paragraphs – used here for the purpose of reference – has also been adopted from this edition.

²³ Quotations from the *De hominis opificio* and from Gregory's *De anima et resurrectione* are given in the English translation of W. MOORE and H.A. WILSON: *Select Writings and Letters of Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa*. Grand Rapids, Michigan 1994 (= *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. Second Series*. Vol. V). – hereafter quoted as M&W. For a commented French translation of the *De hominis opificio*, see J. LAPLACE &

Gregory criticizes both Origen's doctrine on the pre-existence of the souls²⁴ as well as the view of Origen's opponent Methodius of Olympus. In his *De Resurrectione* (CPG 1812)²⁵ the latter states that the soul was created after the body in accordance with the account in Genesis 2:7: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Gregory of Nyssa admits that the question – τὸ ἀμφιβαλλόμενον ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις περὶ ψυχῆς τε καὶ σώματος – is subject of controversy. He himself takes a position between Origen and Methodius,²⁶ and argues that the body and the soul came into existence simultaneously, as one inseparable whole.²⁷ For Gregory, the unity of the human being demands a unity of principle, that is, in the original will of God as well as on the occasion of the conception of individuals.

For it is perhaps not beyond our present subject to discuss the question which has been raised in the churches touching soul and body. Some of those before our time who have dealt with the question of 'principles' think it right to say that souls have a previous existence as a people in a society of their own [...] Others on the contrary, marking the order of the making of man as stated by Moses, say, that the soul is second to the body in order of time. (Ch. 28, §1; M&W: 419)

J. DANIELLOU, *Grégoire de Nysse. La création de l'homme*. Paris 2002 (1943) (= *Sources Chrétiennes* 6).

²⁴ Origen is named here as the author of the *De Principiis* (CPG 1482): "Τοῖς μὲν γὰρ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν [...] οἷς ὁ περὶ τῶν ἀρχῶν ἐπραγματεύθη λόγος [...]" (*De hominis opificio* ch. 28, §1); *De Principiis* ed. PG 11: 115-414; H. GÖRGEMANNS & H. KARPP, *Vier Bücher von den Prinzipien, herausgegeben, übersetzt, mit kritischen und erläuterenden Anmerkungen versehen*. Darmstadt 1976; P. KOETSCHAU, *Origenes Werke V. De principiis*. Leipzig 1913; also H. CROUZEL & M. SIMONETTI, *Origène. Traité des principes*, in the *Sources Chrétiennes* 252 (1878), 253 (1978), 268 (1980), 269 (1980), 312 (1984); see for the pre-existence of the soul e.g. *De Principiis* I 7,4.

²⁵ Ed. PG 18: 265-329; G.N. BONWETSCH, *Methodius Olympius, Werke*. Leipzig 1917: 219-424; for the controversy with Origen see L.G. PATTERSON, *The Anti-Originist Theologie of Methodius of Olympus*. Columbia University 1958 (Ph.D. Thesis); the appendix on p. 506-537 deals with the influence of Methodius on Gregory of Nyssa.

²⁶ A remarkable parallel to chapters 28 and 29 of the *De hominis opificio* can be found in Gregory's *Dialogus de anima et resurrectione* (CPG 3149), Ed. PG 46: 11-160; 108 et seq; "For if we were to grant that the soul has lived previous to its body in some place of resort peculiar to itself, then we cannot avoid seeing some force in all that fantastic teaching lately discussed, which would explain the soul's habitation of the body as a consequence of some vice. Again on the other hand, no one who can reflect will imagine an after-birth of the soul, i.e. that it is younger than the moulding of the body." (M&W: 458; PG 46: 125)

²⁷ See for this issue K. GRONAU, *Poseidonius und die jüdisch-christliche Genesisexegese*. Leipzig/Berlin 1914: 193-206; also E. STEPHANOU, "La coexistence initiale du corps et de l'âme, d'après saint Grégoire de Nysse", *Echos d'Orient* 331 (1932): 304-315.

In this debate John the Exarch occupies a position alongside Methodius.²⁸ When he argues for the creation of the body before the soul, he defends a literal interpretation of the biblical passage. It becomes clear that John drew upon the *De hominis opificio* from the fact that he follows Gregory's argumentation, if only to be able to refute it. He opens the discussion on this matter by referring to 'men of the church' with an unblemished conduct of life ("црькѣвьннѣ мѣжи добро житиѣ нмѣцѣ"), whom he nevertheless accuses of taking an illegitimate opinion in the matter regarding the simultaneous creation of body and soul. According to John, they reject the account of the Scriptures on the basis of the argument that a later creation of the soul would imply a lesser value than the body for the purpose of which it was created:

НЪ СЕГО МѢСТА ДОШЪДЪШЕ СИЦЕ ПОМЪСЛНХОМЪ ПОБЕСѢДОВАТИ, ІАКОЖЕ НЕПОДОБНѢ ЦРЬКѢВЬННѣ Мѣжи добро житиѣ нмѣцѣ глаголаша рекѣцѣ, ꙗкоже нѣкоу пѣно тѣло съ доушею чловѣчьско сътворено; [...] нмѣже вѣпрашаша нхъ ннѣ рекѣцѣ, ацѣ да послаждѣ бѣистъ доуша тѣлесе, то горьши кѣтъ тѣла, нмѣже того цѣца кѣтъ сътворена. (85-86; 216a)

This statement relates remarkably well with Gregory of Nyssa's criticism of Methodius of Olympus' opinion:

[...] and by this argument they prove that the flesh is more noble than the soul; that which was previously formed than that which was afterwards infused into it; for they say that the soul was made for the body, that the thing formed might not be without breath and motion; and that everything that is made for something else is surely less precious than that for which it is made. (Ch. 28, §1; M&W: 419)

Nor again are we in our doctrine to begin by making up man like a clay figure, and to say that the soul came into being for the sake of this; for surely in that case the intellectual nature would be shown to be less precious than the clay figure. But as man is one, the being consisting of soul and body, we are to suppose that the beginning of his existence is one, common to both parts, so that he should not be found to be antecedent and posterior to himself, if the bodily element were first in point of time, and the other were a later addition; (Ch. 29, §1; M&W: 420)

It is interesting to note that John the Exarch suggests that the argument that the soul would be less valuable as a later creation is not so much from these 'men of the church', but is put into their mouth by others in the form of a question ("нмѣже вѣпрашаша нхъ ннѣ рекѣцѣ"). These men themselves ("снѣ") would

²⁸ At least here, in his *Šestodnev*. As a translator of John Damascene's *De fide orthodoxa* he gave a Slav voice also to Gregory's opinion, which was adopted by Damascene: cf. P.B. KOTTER, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos* II. Ἐκδοσις ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως. *Expositio fidei*. Berlin – New York 1973: 76 (ch. 26): "Ἀμα δὲ τὸ σῶμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ πέπλασται, οὐ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον, τὸ δὲ ὕστερον κατὰ τὰ Ὀριγένους ληρήματα" – "The body and the soul were formed simultaneously, and not the one first and the other afterwards, according to Origen's nonsensical assertions." See John the Exarch's *Bogoslovie*, L. SADNIK, *Des hl. Johannes von Damaskus* Ἐκθεσις ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως in *der Übersetzung des Exarchen Johannes*. Bd 2. Freiburg i. Br. 1981: 84: "коупно же ѡша н плѣтъ сътворена, не оуоу пѣрьвоу, оуоу же послаждѣ по еригенѣсцѣн бѣада." "

have replied to this assertion several times, saying that that which comes later should not therefore be of lesser worth:

[...] ГРѢБѢ БО ОНѢМЪ ВЪПРАШАВЪШЕМЪ Н СНИ НЕ ВѢДѢ КОЛНЧЬСКЪ СѢТЪ ОТЪВѢЩААИ. НЕ БЪІВАІЕТЪ БО, ДА ІЕЖЕ ПОСЛѢЖДЕ БѢДЕТЪ, ТО ТО ХОУЖДЕ ІЕСТЪ ПРѢВОБЪІВЪШААГО. (85-88; 216a-b)

Indeed, John's refutation has clear parallels in the *De hominis opificio*. The counter-argument – what is created later should not be of lesser value – seems to have been taken from the eighth chapter of Gregory's treatise, in which the same examples can be found: (1) the grass is created before the animals, but the animal is not of lesser worth than the grass, which is created exactly to serve as its food, and (2) the plants (*De hominis opificio*: the animals) were created before man, but man is not of lesser worth than the plants (*De hominis opificio*: the animals), which were created exactly for his purpose:

НЕ БЪІВАІЕТЪ БО, ДА ІЕЖЕ ПОСЛѢЖДЕ БѢДЕТЪ, ТО ТО ХОУЖДЕ ІЕСТЪ ПРѢВОБЪІВЪШААГО. ТРАВНОІЕ БО СѢНО ПРѢЖДЕ БЕСЛОВЕСЬНААГО СКОТА СЪТВОРЕНО БЪІСТЪ, НЪ ПИЩА РАДН СКОТНА, НМЪ ЖЕ БЪІТН БѢАШЕ; А НЕ СКОТЪ БЪІВААШЕ ТРАВЪ ЦѢЩА. Н ВСЕ ЖЕ ІЕСТЬСТВО СѢМЕНЬНОІЕ Н БЕСПЛОДЬНААГО ДѢВНА ПРОЗѢВАННІЕ, ІЕЩЕ ЖЕ Н ІЕЖЕ ПЛОДЪ КРЪМАЩИНН ТВОРИТЪ, ДРЕВАЕ ЗѢЛО НЕ БЪІТНІЕ ПРНВЕДЕНО БЪІСТЪ ЧЛОВѢЧЬСКА СѢЩНА; НЪ НѢСТЪ ЧЛОВѢКЪ АКЪ ТОГО РАДН СЪТВОРЕНЪ, НИ ІЕСТЪ ХОУЖДНИ ТОГО ОВОЦА Н ДРѢВА. (87-88; 216b)

τάχα γὰρ οὐ μόνον τὸ ἐκ τοῦ προχείρου νοούμενον διὰ τούτων μαθάνομεν, ὅτι τῶν ζώων ἔνεκεν ἢ πόα χρήσιμος ἐφάνη τῷ Κτίσαντι, διὰ δὲ τὸν ἄνθρωπον τὰ βοτά, οὗ χάριν πρὸ μὲν τῶν βοσκημάτων ἢ ἐκείνων τροφή, πρὸ δε τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ ὑπηρετεῖν μέλλον τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ ζωῇ. (Ch. 8, §3; FORBES: 140)

for it may be that we learn from these facts not only the obvious thought, that grass appeared to the Creator useful for the sake of the animals, while the animals were made because of man, and that for this reason, before the animals there was made their food, and before man that which was to minister to human life. (M&W: 393)

According to John, it is rather the other way round, as indicated by the creation of mankind: the last to be created, Man, is the most precious because everything before him was created to be of use to him:

ОТЪВРѢНЬ БО БЪІВАІЕТЪ: ПОСЛѢЖДЕ БЪІВЪШААГО ЧЛОВѢКА ТО ВСЕ ПРѢЖДЕ ВАРНЪ БЪІСТЪ, НЕИЗГЛАГОЛЕМѢН ПРѢМѢДРОСТН ВСЕ ТО ОСѢДНѢШН ПРѢЖДЕ НА ПОТРЕБѢ ЧЛОВѢКОУ Н НА СПѢХЪ. ДА НѢСТЪ ОУБО ВСЕ, ІЕЖЕ ПРѢЖДЕ СЪТВОРЕНО ПОСЛѢДЬНѢАГО, ТО ЖЕ Н ЧЪСТЫНѢ ІЕГО. АЩЕ ЛН ДА НѢСТЪ ТАКО, ТО ОУЖЕ ВСЬ Н ГАДЪ, Н ПЪТНЦА, Н РЪІБЪ, Н ЗВѢРЬ, ОУННН ЧЛОВѢКА Н ЧЪСТЫНѢ ОБРАЩЕТЪ СѦ ПО НѢЖДН ТАЦѢМЪ ЧННОМЪ, НМЪЖЕ ПРѢЖДЕ ЧЛОВѢКА ТО БЪІСТЪ. НЪ ОПАКЪ СЕ БЪІВАІЕТЪ ПАЧЕ ІЕЖЕ БО ПРѢЖДЕ ВАРНЪ БЪІСТЪ ТѢХЪ ЦѢЩА, НМЪЖЕ БѢАШЕ ПОСЛѢЖДЕ БЪІТН. (87-90; 216b-c)

The same idea can be found throughout the *De hominis opificio*, most explicitly in chapters 2: *Why man appeared last, after the creation*, and 3: *That the nature of man is more precious than all the visible creation*.²⁹

Οὕτω γὰρ τὸ μέγα τοῦτο καὶ τίμιον χρῆμα, ὁ ἄνθρωπος, τῷ κόσμῳ τῶν ὄντων ἐπεχωρίαζεν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν εἰκὸς, τὸν ἄρχοντα πρὸ τῶν ἀρχομένων ἀναφανῆναι, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς πρότερον ἐτοιμασθείσης, ἀκόλουθον ἦν ἀναδειχθῆναι τὸν βασιλεύοντα. (Ch. 2, §1; FORBES: 120)

For not as yet had that great and precious thing, man, come into the world of being; it was not to be looked for that the ruler should appear before the subjects of his rule; but when his dominion was prepared, the next step was that the king should be manifested. (M&W: 390)

John thus concludes that the body was formed before the soul, explicitly calling upon on the authority of Genesis 2:7:

ΔΑ ΤΕΜΕΩ ΟΥΒΟ ΠΟ ΜΟСѢОВѢ ПОВѢСТН ТѢЛО ΔΟΥША ΠΡΕЖΔΕ ΒΥΙСТЪ, ВЪЗЪМЪШЮ ТВОРЬЦЮ ПРѢСТЪ ОΥЪ ΖΕΜΛΑ Η СЪТВОРЬШЮ ІѢ Η СЪСЪДНѢШЮ БРЪННЮ Η ВЪСЕ ВЕ ЧЮВЪСТВА КАПНЦЕ. ПО ТОМЪ ЖЕ БΥΙСТЪ ΔΟΥША БОЖЕСТВЪНЪИМЪ ВЪΔΟΥНОВЕННІЕМЪ БЕС ПОСРѢДНІА СЪЦІНІА БΥІВЪШН Η ΠΡΗΗΜЪШН СЪЦІНІЕ. (89-92; 216c-d)

John the Exarch mentions yet another allegation of these “men of the church”: they say that not only on the occasion of Creation, but also with the conception of a child in the mother’s womb body and soul are formed simultaneously: “ІЕСΤЪ ЖЕ, РѢША, Η ΠΡΕЖΔΕ ВЪ ПРѢВѢН ТВАРН Η НЪІНѢ ВЪ КОІЕНЖЪΔΟ ПТРОБѢ ТВОРΗМЪІН ΜΛΑΔΕΝΗЦѢ” (85-86; 216a). This is exactly what Gregory of Nyssa does in the first paragraphs of chapter 29 of the *De hominis opificio*:

but we are to say that in the power of God’s foreknowledge [...] all the fulness of human nature had pre-existence [...] and in the creation of individuals not to place the one element before the other, neither the soul before the body, nor the contrary, that man may not be at strife against himself, by being divided by the difference in point of time. (Ch. 29, §1; M&W 420-421)

[...] – in the same way we suppose the human germ to possess the potentiality of its nature, sown with it at the first start of its existence, and that it is unfolded and manifested by a natural sequence as it proceeds to its perfect state [...] so that it is not true to say either that the soul exists before the body, or that the body exists without the soul, but that there is one beginning of both; (Ch. 29, §3; M&W: 421)

The idea of a simultaneous inception of body and soul is criticized by John again and again he bases his argument on the words of the Scriptures, namely Exodus 21:22-23: “ἐὰν δὲ μάχωνται δύο ἄνδρες καὶ πατάξωσιν γυναῖκα ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσιν, καὶ ἐξέλθῃ τὸ παιδίον αὐτῆς μὴ ἐξεικονισμένον, ἐπιζήμιον ζημιωθήσεται· καθότι ἂν ἐπιβάλῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ τῆς γυναικός, δώσει μετὰ ἀξιώματος· ἐὰν δὲ ἐξεικονισμένον

²⁹ Κεφάλαιον β. Διὰ τί τελευταῖος μετὰ τὴν κτίσιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος (FORBES: 120 et seq.) and Κεφάλαιον γ. Ὅτι τιμιωτέρα πάσης τῆς φαινομένης κτίσεως ἡ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσις (FORBES: 124 et seq.).

However, John lays the emphasis on that which does *not* yet exist in the embryo: the rational and immortal soul:

А ІЕЖЕ СЪМА НСХОДНТЪ МѢЖЬСКОЕ Н ПРѢПОУЩАЕМО ВЪ ЛОЖЕ ЖЕНЬСКА ПОЛОУ, ТЪЧНИѢ НМАТЪ СЛАЗИ ІЕДННЪІ ІЕСТЬСТВЕНААГО ЖИВОТА, НМН ЖЕ РАСТЕТЪ КРЪМА СѦ НЕ НМЪІ ВЪ СЕБѢ ЧЮТЪНЪІА НН ШЬСТЪНЪІА, БОЛЕ ЖЕ ПАЧЕ НН РАЗΟΥМНВААГО НН РАЗМЫСЛНВААГО СѢЩНІА, БЕСЪМРЪТЪНЪІА ДΟΥША. [...] (97-100; 217c-d)

It is thus clear, according to John – both from what man sees in nature as from the Genesis account of the Creation – that the body is formed first before the soul:

ВЪСЕ СЕ ГРѢБО ІЕСТЪ, О НЕМЪ ЖЕ ПРНХОДНТЪ НЪІ Н ВЕЛЪМН СѦ ЧЮДНТН, КАКО СЕ ІЕСТЪ, ІЕЛЪМА ЖЕ Н ІЕСТЬСТВЕНОУМОУ ЧННОУ СЪКАЗАІЩЮ Н ВЕЛНКОУМОУ ΜΟΥΣΕΩΒН Н ПО ПРЪВААГО ЧЛОВѢКА СЪТВОРЕННЮ Н ПО ПРНСНОБЪІВАІЩЮМОУ ПРѢЖДЕ СЪСТАІЩЮ СѦ ТЪЛЕСНОУМОУ ІЕСТЬСТВОУ. ВЪСЕ ТО ІАВЛѢІЕТЪ, ІАКОЖЕ ПРѢЖДЕ ТЪЛО СѦ СЪСТАНЕТЪ, ТН ПОТОМЪ БѢДЕТЪ ДΟΥШЬНОЕ БЪІТІЕ. (101-102; 218a)

The Exarch expresses his astonishment that these ‘men of the Church’ (“снн”) reject what is so evident and that they accept a doctrine that contradicts the Holy Scriptures (101-104; 218a-218b). On this point John stops referring to his opponents – these ‘men of the Church’ – in the plural, but suddenly speaks of a “great teacher of the Church” (“велнкааго оучнтелѣ црѣкѣвѣнааго”). John has only one explanation for the contradictions in the work of this ‘great teacher’: it must have been corrupted by heretics. These heretics would have infused their own reprehensible ideas into his doctrine like “poison in honey”,³² so that people would also reject his other doctrinal statements on account of these words.

ДА ТОГО ЦѢЩА ПОДОБА ІЕСТЪ РАЗΟΥМѢВАТН НАМЪ, ІАКО ЖЕ НѢСТЪ ТО СВОЕ ОУЧЕННІЕ ВЕЛНКААГО ОУЧНТЕЛѣ ЦРѢКѣВѣНААГО, НЪ НСКАЖЕНО ІЕСТЪ ВЪМѢШАІЩЕМЪ ІЕРЕТНКОМЪ СВОІА ЗЛАІА ОУЧЕННІА АКЪІ ІАДЪ ВЪ МЕДЪ ВЪМЕЩЩЕ, ДА БНША ОТЪ СНЪЗ СЛОВЕСЪ Н ННѢХЪ ІЕМОУ ОУЧЕННН НЕ ПРННМАЛН. (103-104; 218b)

Only now does John reveal the name of the unfortunate ‘teacher of the Church’: it is Gregory, who is in nothing second to his brother Basil:

³² This formulation is also used in the *De hominis opificio*, albeit in a totally different context – a context which, however, might have seemed suitable to John: the excerpt deals with the forbidden tree in Paradise: “αὕτη τοίνυν ἡ σύμμικτός ἐστι καρποφορία, σαφῶς τοῦ λόγου τὸν νοῦν ἐρμηνεύοντος, καθ’ ὃν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ γνωστὸν ὠνομάσθη τὸ ξύλον ἐκεῖνο. ὅτι κατὰ τὴν τῶν δηλητηρίων κακίαν τῶν παραρτυθέντων τῷ μέλιτι, καθὸ μὲν καταγλυκαίνει τὴν αἴσθησιν, καλὸν εἶναι δοκεῖ. καθὸ δὲ φθείρει τὸν προσαπτόμενον, κακοῦ παντὸς ἔσχατον γίνεται.” (Ch. 20, §4; FORBES: 228), “This, then, is that fruit-bearing of mixed character, where the passage clearly expresses the sense in which the tree was called ‘capable of the knowledge of good and evil’, because, like the evil nature of poisons that are prepared with honey, it appears to be good in so far as it affects the senses with sweetness, but in so far as it destroys him who touches it, it is the worst of all evil.” (M&W: 410)

ГРІГОРИИ БО ЧЫСТЫНИ, ТАКОЖЕ И РОДОМЪ ПРИСНЗІИ БРАТЪ ВЕЛИКОУМОУ ВАСИЛІЮ ІЕСТЪ,
ТАКО ЖЕ И ОУМОМЪ И ВЪРОІЖ И ДОБРЫИМЪ ИЗВОЛЕНІЕМЪ, ИСТИННЫИКЪ И НЕ ХОУЖДНИ
ОНОГО НИЧИНМЪЖЕ, НЪ ВЪСЪКЪЗІ ХЪІТРОСТИ И МЪДРОСТИ ИСПЛЫНЕНЪ. (103-106; 218b-c)

John proceeds by stating that there are many untrue theories mixed into Gregory's doctrine by those who have the custom "to corrupt the true doctrine in many instances". Gregory would have had the habit to hand out his writings to unreliable people, who asked for permission to copy them. In addition, John refers to yet another cause that makes Gregory's doctrine susceptible to heretical interpolations, but he refrains from mentioning it:

ПО МЪНОГА ЖЕ МЪСТА ВЪ ОУЧЕННІЕ ІЕГО СІЦА ОУЧЕННІА НЕПОДОБНА ВЪМЪШАНА СЪТЪ
ТЪМНІ, ИЖЕ ОБЫЧАИ НМЪТЪ, ИСТИННОІЕ ПРАВОВЪРЬСТВО ПО МЪНОГА МЪСТА КАЗНТИ.
НМЪЖЕ, ІЕГДА ЧЪТО ПИША ТО ВЪДАДАШЕ ПРОСАЩИНМЪ ІЕ ПРЪПИСАТИ, А СЪЩЕМЪ
ВРАГОМЪ МЪНОГЪИМЪ КРНОВЪРЬНЫИМЪ. МЪНАТЪ ЖЕ И ДРОУГЪІЖ ВНИЖ, ІЕАЖЕ
ЦЪЩА ОУДОБЪ БЪАШЕ, ВЪ ОУЧЕННІА ІЕГО ВЪМЪШАТИ СВОІА СЛОВЕСА СЪПРОТНВЪНЫИМЪ;
НЪ О СЕМЪ И СЕ ДОВЪЛЪІЕТЪ. (103-106; 218b-c)

It is clear that John does not want to accuse the bishop of Nyssa of heresy. Here it must also be noted that allegations about heretic interpolations in Gregory's writings – due to his adoption of Origen's doctrine concerning the *apokatastasis* – were current since Germanus of Constantinople (Patriarch 715-730).³³ On account of the supposed contradictions in Gregory's treatise and by reason of the existing idea on heresy in his writings it was possible for John to depict the church father as a victim of heretical interpolations.

Whereas the fragment described above relies heavily on chapter 29 of the *De hominis opificio*, the subsequent fragment (105-150; 218c-224a) contains a refutation of the beliefs attributed to Origen concerning the pre-existence and the transmigration of souls in chapter 28 of Gregory's treatise. John the Exarch directly confronts the heretics who claim that the souls already existed before the bodies and that these souls departed from their incorporeal and sublime life out of their own free will to sink down into bodies:

А ЧЪТО НМАМЪ КЪ ВАМЪ ГЛАГОЛАТИ! КЪ ІЕРЕТІКОМЪ, ИЖЕ ГЛАГОЛІЖТЪ ДОУША СЪЩА
ПРЪЖДЕ ТЪЛЕСЪ, СЪПЛЪЗНІВЪША СА БЕСПЛЪЗЪНЫИА ЖИЗНИ И ОУНЫШААГО СТРОІА, ОТЪ

³³ See J. DANÉLOU, "L'apocatastase chez Grégoire de Nysse", *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 30 (1940): 335-336 : "Dans une apologie de Grégoire de Nysse que nous n'avons plus, mais dont Photius nous a conservé le résumé dans sa *Bibliothèque*, Germain de Constantinople prétendait formellement que Grégoire n'avait pas enseigné l'apocatastase et que les passages incriminés, celui de la *Vie de Moïse* en particulier, étaient des falsifications introduites dans son œuvre par des hérétiques, soucieux de détruire son autorité. Cette opinion sera désormais traditionnelle dans l'Eglise grecque. On la trouve dans la notice de Nicéphore Calliste sur Grégoire de Nysse." For the excerpt from Photius' *Myriobiblon*, see PG 103: 1105-1108; for the fragment from Nicephorus Callistus' *Historia ecclesiastica*, see PG 146: 627-630.

НѢКАКОГО СЪВРАЩЕННІА Н СВОЕВОЛІААГО НЕСЪМЫСЛА Н ЛѢНОСТІ, Н ВЪ ТѢЛЕСА ЧЛОВѢЧЬСКА ВЪХОДАЩА. (105-108; 218c-d)

This time John the Exarch does adopt the arguments of the bishop of Nyssa, as well as his description of the false doctrine: the heretics believe that the souls are capable to return to their original state; however, if these souls incline towards the material and lower level of existence, they sink down further and consequently end up in animals and vegetation to eventually end in nothingness and to stop existing altogether:

ТН АЩЕ ВЪ ННХЪ СѦЩА ПАЧЕ СІ ДОБРЕШѦ ЖИЗНЬ ОУДОБРАТЪ, ТО Н ВЪ ДРЕВННН ПAKЪ ВЪННДѦТЪ ОУСТРОН. АЩЕ ЛН ЛЮБАЩА ПАЧЕ СЕІА ВНДНМЪІА ВЕЩН [Н] ЖИЗНН Н ПРНЛПАЩА НХЪ НА ННЗЪКОІЕ СА СЪПАЛЪЗНѦТЪ, ТО ПАКЪ СЪСТѦПАТЪ Н ВЪ ГОРЬШНН ОБРАЗЪ СКОТНН Н ОТЪТѦДОУ ПАКЪ ВЪ САДЪІ Н ВЪ ВЪСѢКО ДРЕВО ВЪХОДАТЪ Н СЪТЪНБІЕ ВЪ НЕБЪІТНІЕ ОТНДѦТЪ Н ПОГЪІБНѦТЪ. НѦЖДА БО СЕМОУ ТАКО БЪІТН, ІЕЛМАЖЕ ДОУША НА ОУНЬШННѦ СЕБЕ НЕ ПРѢМѢНѢИТЪ, НЪ НА ГОРЬШННѦ. (107-110; 218d-219a)

Although it is a simplification of Gregory's wording, the passage offers a remarkable parallel to the paragraphs 3-6 of chapter 28 from the *De hominis opificio*:³⁴

For if the soul, being severed from the more exalted state by some wickedness, after having once, as they say, tasted corporeal life, again becomes a man, and if the life in the flesh is, as may be presumed, acknowledged to be, in comparison with the eternal and incorporeal life, more subject to passion, it naturally follows that that which comes to be in a life such as to contain more occasions of sin, is both placed in a region of greater wickedness and rendered more subject to passion than before [...]; and that being brought into close connection with this, it descends to the brute nature [...] Thus it will of necessity be continually changed for the worse, always proceeding to what is more degraded and always finding out what is worse than the nature in which it is: and just as the sensible nature is lower than the rational, so too there is a descent from this to the insensible. (Ch. 28 §4)

Strict inference points to the complete destruction of the soul; for that which has once fallen from the exalted state will be unable to halt at any measure of wickedness, but

³⁴ The parallel in the *De anima et resurrectione* is even more striking: "Some indeed make human nature vile in their comprehensiveness, maintaining that a soul becomes alternately that of a man and of something irrational; that it transmigrates into various bodies, changing at pleasure from the man into fowl, fish, or beast, and then returning to human kind" (PG 46: 108; M&W: 453); "For I have heard persons who hold these opinions saying that whole nations of souls are hidden away somewhere in a realm of their own [...] and that these souls, having individually lost their wings through some gravitation towards evil, become embodied [...]; so that that inherently fine and buoyant thing that the soul is first becomes weighted and downward tending in consequence of some vice, and so migrates to a human body; then its reasoning powers are extinguished, and it goes living in some brute; and then even this gift of sensation is withdrawn, and it changes into the insensate plant life; but after that mounts up again by the same gradations until it is restored to its place in heaven." (M&W: 455; PG 46: 112-113)

will pass by means of its relation with the passions from rational to irrational, and from the latter state will be transferred to the insensibility of plants; and on the insensible there borders, so to say, the inanimate; and on this again follows the non-existent, so that absolutely by this train of reasoning they will have the soul to pass into nothing: thus a return once more to the better state is impossible for it: and yet they make the soul return from a bush to the man. (Ch. 28 §5; M&W: 420)

Here John introduces an (original?) piece of rhetoric, elaborating on the question how it is possible for people to believe in the pre-existence of the souls: “ДА НЖЕ ТАКЪ БЛАДН Н БАСНН ПРОПОВѢДАЮТЪ, ТО ТѢХЪ ВЪПРАШАНМЪ РЕКЮЩЕ: КАКО МѢНИТЕ ДУША ПРЕЖДЕ СЪЩА ТѢЛЕСЪ?” (109-110; 219a) The first inquiry that is addressed the heretics deals with the question, whether they have read the books of Moses or not: “ПОЧНТАВЪШЕ ЛН КЪННГЪ МОУСѢОВЪ, ВЪ ННХЪ ЖЕ ГЛАГОЛЕТЪ РЕКЪ, СЪТВОРИМЪ ЧЛОВѢКА [...] НЛН НѢСТЪ ПОЧНТАЛН? (109-110; 219a) If they have not read them, then nothing can redeem them: “ДА АЩЕ ОТЪВѢЩАЕТЕ ВЪТОРОМУ СЛОВЕСН ВЪПРАШАННІА СЕГО, ТО НИКАКОЖЕ ВАСЪ НЕ МОЖЕТЪ СЛОВО НИЦѢЛНТИ, ІЕЛМА ЖЕ ОТЪЧАЛАН СА ІЕСТЕ” (109-112; 219a-b), while their senseless faith would be incomprehensible had they indeed read it: “ДА АЩЕ ПРЪВОІЕ РЕКЮТЪ, ТО СКОРО ОУСЛЫШАТЪ ОТЪВѢТЪ, РЕКЮЩЕМЪ НАМЪ: ТО КАКО ВЕЛНКОУМОУ МОУСѢОВН ПОВѢДАЮЩЮ Н РЕКЮЩЮ: БОГЪ ГЛАГОЛА, СЪТВОРИМЪ ЧЛОВѢКА [...] ДА Н ПО СЕМОУ ІЕСТЪ ОУЧЕННЮ ІАВѢ ВѢДѢТИ, ІАКОЖЕ ТЪГДА БЫСТЪ ПРЪВААГО ЧЛОВѢКА ДУША, ІЕАЖЕ НЕ БѢ ПРЕЖДЕ, А ВЪ ПРЕЖДЕ ІЪ БЫВЪШЪ ПРОПОВѢДАЕТЕ ЗЪЛЛОВѢРЬНѢ Н ДРЪЗЪ” (113-116; 219c-d). If they do know the books of Moses, then a second question needs to be put across to them: do they believe the words of Moses, or not? “НЪ КАКО АКЪ ЛН ВЕЛНКОУМОУ МОУСѢОВН НЕ ВѢРОУЮЩЕ, НЛН АКЪ ВѢРОУЮЩЕ?” (115-116; 219d) In the first instance, namely, if they do not accept the Mosaic writings, it would mean that they also do not believe in God – “ДА АЩЕ ПРЪВОІЕ, ТО ОБРѢТАЕТЕ СА ІАВѢ, ІАКОЖЕ Н ТВОРЬЦЮ БОГОУ НЕ ВѢРОУЕТЕ” (115-116; 219d) – the words of Moses are after all the Word of God. When the heretics claim to believe in his words, then they must also keep account with the precise formulation and meaning of the words: “АЩЕ ВЪТОРОІЕ РЕЧЕТЕ Н ВѢРОУЕТЕ ВЕЛНКОУМОУ МОУСѢОВН, ТО РАЗОУМѢНТЕ, КАКО ТН РЕЧЕ: Н СЪЗЪДА БОГЪ ЧЛОВѢКА [...]” (117-118; 220a).

John elaborates even further on Gregory’s arguments. He states that it becomes perfectly clear from the words of the Scriptures that the soul could not have existed before God blew the breath of life into the first man, but that it started existing at that very moment. Nothing did exist before it was created as narrated in Genesis; God created everything out of nothing (117-128; 220a-221b):

[...] ДА ІЕЛМАЖЕ, ІЕГДА НА ЛНЦЕ ВЪЗДОУНЪ АДАМОУ, ТЪГДА ЖЕ БЫСТЪ ДУША БОЖЬСТВЕНААГО ВЪДОУНОВЕННІА БЛАГОДАТНІЪ, ТО ДОБРѢ, ІАВѢ ТО ІЕСТЪ ВНДѢТИ, ІАКОЖЕ ПРЕЖДЕ НЕ БѢАШЕ ІЕА [...] Н ВЪ ВСЕН ЖЕ ТВАРН СЕГО МНРА ІЕЖЕ НѢСТЪ НСПРЪВА БЫЛО, ТО ТО ТВОРНМО ІЕСТЪ [...] НЪ НЕ, ІЕЖЕ ПРЕЖДЕ БЫЛО. (117-120; 220a-b)

According to John, the wording of Genesis 2:7 – especially the expression “the breath of life” – clearly excludes the kind of bodiless souls that fall down from

their exalted state into human or animal bodies. Moreover, If such a thing would be true, all creatures would have the same kind of soul as Man – a soul that is immaterial, rational and immortal:

рече же, дѣхновеніе животѣ, да покажетъ различіе бесплѣтныѣа и безвещныѣа и разоумныѣа и словесныѣа и бесѣмрътныѣа доуша, рекъше, ѣже отъпала іестъ отъ добрѣша жнзніи и оустроѣа. [...] то и прѣжде сѣтвореніа чловекоу всѣ животѣ, нже нзъ водѣи и нже нзъ землѣи и нзъ въздоуха по образоу божію бѣша и по подобѣствоу, нмѣже така нхъ доиде доуша, ѣкоже послѣжде нмѣ чловекъ бесплѣтнѣи и бестѣлѣннѣи и разоумныѣи и сѣмъислѣннѣи и бесѣмрътнѣи. (221a-b)

[...] глаголюще, іегоже нѣстъ подобѣ вѣровати, ѣкоже прѣжде вѣндетъ въ чловека, ѣже сѣ іестъ сѣ оуныша сѣплѣзла доуша, ти никакѣ же іен оунышннѣи сѣтворивши въ іестѣствѣ прохотѣти пакѣи сквозѣ скотѣи и звѣрь и гадѣ. вѣи же коіждо отъ тѣхъ исповѣдасте, ѣкоже прѣжде чловека бѣтиа сѣмъислѣннѣи доушѣи и разоумныѣи и бесѣмрътнѣи приааи сѣтѣ. (221d)

If one believes in such an idea, then the godly assignment to man to rule over the rest of creation and to use other creatures as food³⁵ would make no sense at all:

како, акѣи аи іедноосѣбно и тождѣ іестѣства акѣи чловеци, властѣи повелѣннѣи животѣи всѣмѣи и въ брѣшнѣи мѣсто нмѣти ѣко и зѣліе, нли акѣи нного рода сѣще и іестѣства? [...] аще аи наречете прѣвое, то юже іедноплѣменнѣи и іедноосѣбннѣи приааѣ іестъ чловекъ властѣи и іастѣи, и всѣе, іеже заколетъ, овѣцѣи и говѣдо, нли іелѣнь нли жѣравѣи нли нно чѣто, іеже снмѣи жнчѣно, разоумныѣи и размъислѣннѣи доушѣи обрѣтаѣтѣ сѣи отѣлѣчѣи отъ тѣлѣсеи и тождѣсѣбныѣи и тождѣе рода закааѣи и іадѣи. (135-138; 222b-c)³⁶

According to John, Scripture clearly indicates that the other creatures are of a different nature and that they do not possess a rational soul, but an instinctive, bodily and mortal one (“нѣи чюдѣннѣи и плѣтнѣи и сѣмрътнѣи”) (141-142; 223a). Indeed, Scripture clearly indicates that the soul of the animal is its blood: “ѣкоже всѣго живота доуша крѣвь іего іестъ” (141-142; 223a).³⁷ To emphasize the difference between the human and the animal soul John returns to the fact

³⁵ Reference is made to Gen. 9:3: “Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things.”

³⁶ The same line of thought can be found in Gregory’s *De anima et resurrectione*: “With such beliefs a man will look even upon hemlock as not alien to his own nature, detecting, as he does, humanity in the plant. [...] and we find even the fruit of the ears of corn upon which we live are plants; how, then, can one put in the sickle to cut them down; and how can one squeeze the bunch, or pull up the thistle from the field, or gather flowers, or hunt birds, or set fire to the logs of the funeral pyre: it being all the while uncertain whether we are not laying violent hands on kinsmen, or ancestors, or fellow-country-men, and whether it is not through the medium of some body of theirs that the fire is being kindled, and the cup mixed, and the food prepared?” (M&W: 154-455; PG 46: 112)

³⁷ The passage is from Leviticus 17:14 – “ἡ ψυχὴ πάσης σαρκὸς αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐστίν”, “for the life of all flesh is the blood thereof”.

that man has an upright stature as a sign of his rationality, an argument which can be found elsewhere in book VI,³⁸ as well as with Basil³⁹ and Gregory:⁴⁰

АЩЕ БО ПРОЧНИИ ЖИВОТН ТѢЖДЕ, ІЖЕ Н ЧЛОВѢКЪ, ПРѢЖДЕ СѢТЪ ПРИАЛН ДΟΥШѢ, ТО НѢСТЪ ПОДОБА НХЪ ЖИВОТЪ БЕСЛОВЕСНЫИХЪ ЗЪВАТИ, НИ НМЪ ОБРАЗА ТАКОГО АѢПО НМѢТИ НА ЗЕМЛІѢ ЗЪРАЦІА; НЪ ПРОСТО НМЪ БИ ТѢЛО, ІАКОЖЕ Н ЧЛОВѢКОУ, ІАКОЖЕ ГОРѢ ГЛАДАТИ КЪ ПЖНЧЫНѢН Н РАЗΟΥМЫНѢН ОУТВАРН, ІЕСТЬСТВО ПРОТНВѢ СВОІЕН СНАѢ СЪВРЪШАИЩЕ ДѢИСТВИ РАЗΟΥМНЧЫНІА ДΟΥША Н СЪМЫСЛЫНІА. (141-144; 223a-b)

Finally, John concludes his argumentation by stating that every kind of creature received its own natural and unchangeable characteristics, and that, apart from Man, no other creature has received a rational soul.⁴¹ In this manner he rejects the idea that souls can fall down to a lower level of existence as a form of punishment:

ТАКО ЖЕ ПО ТОМОУ ОБРѢТАИТЪ СѦ ТВОРАЩЕ МѢНЪ, НЕ ННАКО, НЪ ПО СВОІЕМОУ КЪЖЕДО РОДОУ, А НѢСТЪ ЗНАТИ, НИ ХОУДА СЛѢДА, СЪГРѢШНВЪШѢ ДΟΥШѢ Н ТѢМЪ ОТЪПАДЪШѢ Н ВЪ СИЦѢ СѢДЪ ГОРЬШИН ОСѢЖДЕНѢ КАЗНИИѢ. ДА СЕИ СИЦЕ ОБЛНЧЕНѢ ДОВОЛНѢ, РЕКЪШЕ БЛАЖННѢН ВѢРѢ, НЖЕ МЫНАТЪ ПРѢЖДЕ СѢЩА ДΟΥША [...] (147-150; 223d-224a)

It is clear from the preceding analysis that John the Exarch drew upon chapters 28 and 29 of the *De hominis opificio* for this passage from book VI of the *Šestodnev*. The procedure is clear: John follows the structure of Gregory's argumentation but rejects that which he finds to be unacceptable on the basis of a literal reading of the Scriptures. Furthermore, he omits everything that does not suit his

³⁸ *Šestodnev* VI, 21-22 (208a); 59-60 (212d); 123-124 (220d); 143-144 (223b); 163-166 (225d-226a).

³⁹ See AMAND DE MENDIETA & RUDBERG, *Basilios von Caesarea Homilien zum Hexaemeron*: 148-149 (= GIET: 486; PG 29: 192); cf. *Šestodnev* VI, 279-282; 240b-240c.

⁴⁰ Esp. chapt. 8, *Why man's form is upright; and that hands were given him because of reason; wherein also is a speculation on the difference of souls*: “Ὁρθιον δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ σχῆμα καὶ πρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνατείνεται καὶ ἄνω βλέπει· ἀρχικὰ καὶ ταῦτα καὶ τὴν βασιλικὴν ἀξίαν ἀποσημαίνοντα· τὸ γὰρ μόνον ἐν τοῖς οὖσι τοιοῦτον εἶναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον, τοῖς δ' ἄλλοις ἅπασι πρὸς τὸ κάτω νενευκέναι τὰ σώματα, σαφῶς δείκνυσι τὴν τῆς ἀξίας διαφορὰν, τῶν τε ὑποκυπτόντων τῇ δυναστείᾳ καὶ τῆς ὑπερανεστῶσης αὐτῶν ἐξουσίας”, “But man's form is upright, and extends aloft towards heaven, and looks upwards, and these are marks of sovereignty which shows his royal dignity. For the fact that man alone among existing things is such as this, while all others bow their bodies downwards, clearly points to the difference of dignity between those which stoop beneath his sway and that power which rises above them.” (Ch. 8, §1; M&W: 393; FORBES: 138).

⁴¹ Cf. Gregory's *De anima et resurrectione*: “To say that one and the same soul [...] is at one time a rational and intellectual soul, and that then it is cavered along with the reptiles, or herds with the birds, or is a beast of burden [...] – to say this, is nothing short of making all things the same and believing that one single nature runs through all beings.” (M&W: 454; PG 46: 109).

argumentation, he shifts, simplifies, repeats and adds some new arguments.⁴² It must be noted that John's dependence on Gregory's treatise can be sensed to a smaller or larger degree in a number of other passages from the *Šestodnef*.

4. The 'Homiliae De creatione hominis'

Although the influence of Gregory's *De hominis opificio* has been clearly indicated, some passages of book VI are completely atypical for the writings of the bishop of Nyssa. One point in particular must be mentioned as a point of dissimilarity, namely the usage of the concepts 'image' (εἰκών) and 'likeness' (ὁμοίωσις) as they occur in Genesis 1:26: "καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν." Gregory himself does not differentiate between the two,⁴³ but John the Exarch draws a distinction between *οὐρανός* and *ποδὸβѣство/подобіє* in up to four instances. According to John, man has received the *οὐρανός*-image as a part of his nature and rank as autonomous and rational being, while the *подобіє*-likeness is a kind of completion and restoration, which he can obtain by striving to achieve God's likeness out of his own free will.

ТѢМЪ БО БЕСПЛЪТНІЕМЪ Н ВЛАСТНІЖ Н РАДОУМОМЪ Н МЪСАНИЖ МѢННМЪ СЪЩА ПО
ОБРАЗУ БОЖНЮ ЧЛОВѢКА. ІЕЩЕ ЖЕ ПРИЕМЛІЩІЮ ПОДВНЗАННІЕМЪ ДОБРАГА НЗВОЛЕННА
ДѢЛНАГА, БЫВАЕТЪ Н ПО ПОДОБѢСТВОУ; ТѢМЪ БО БЖДЕТЪ ПОДОБНЪ КЪ БОГУ. (57-
58; 212c)

[...] ПОСПѢШН ПОДОБНЪ БЫТИ ТОМУ, НЖЕ ТА ІЕСТЪ СЪТВОРИЛЪ БОГЪ, СЪНАБѢДА
БОЖѢСТВНЪН ОБРАЗЪ Н ІЕЖЕ ІЕСТЪ КЪ НЕМОУ ПРОТНВѢ ТВОІЕН СНАѢ ПОДОБНІЕ, ДА Н
ПРННМЕШН ОТЪ НЕГО ДАРОМЪ БЫТИ БОГЪ (67-68; 213d)⁴⁴

АЩЕ Н ПРНПРАЖЕНО ІЕСТЪ КЪ ОБРАЗУ Н ПОДОБѢСТВО ТН МНѢТН ІЕСТЪ ОБОІЕ ТО СЪЩЕ
ІЕДННО Н ТОЖДЕ, НЪ НѢСТЪ ІЕДННО, НЪ РАЗЛНЧНІЕ НМАТЪ. ОВО БО САМОВАСТЫНААГО
САНА РАДОУМНААГО ЦѢЩА СЪЩННА ПРННМАТН ІЕСТЪ СЪЩННѢ КЪ НЕМОУ ВЪСѢМЪ
ЧЛОВѢКОМЪ, Н ПОСПѢШННІЕМЪ ЖЕ Н ЗЪЛЫНМЪ. А ІЕЖЕ ПО ПОДОБѢСТВОУ, ПО
НЗВОЛЕННЮ НАШЕМОУ СЪВРЪШЕННІЕ Н ЦѢЛЕННІЕ ПРИЕМЛЕТЪ. (75-76; 214d-215a)

A similar distinction is made by some of the Fathers, e.g. by Irenaeus of Lyon,⁴⁵ by Clemens of Alexandria,⁴⁶ by Origen in his *De principiis*,⁴⁷ and by Maximus

⁴² It is not unlikely that John drew upon Gregory's *De anima et resurrectione* for some of the arguments not found in the *De hominis opificio* – cf. *supra* notes 26, 31, 34, 36 and 41; John certainly knew this work: one of the appendices to his *Bogoslovie*, viz. chapt. 53, НЕВѢРЬНААГО ВЪПРОСЪ, contains a passage from the *De anima et resurrectione* – ed. L. SADNIK, "Die Bruchstücke aus Väterschriften...", *Anzeiger für slavische Philologie* 10-11 (1979).

⁴³ For a bibliography concerning Gregory of Nyssa's theology of the Image, cf. M. ALTENBURGER & F. MANN, *Bibliographie zu Gregor von Nyssa. Editionen – Übersetzungen – Literatur*. Leiden – New York – København – Köln 1988: 323.

⁴⁴ See also 71-72 (214b).

⁴⁵ Cf. his *Adversus haereses* (CPG 1306), book V, chapters 6 and 16.

⁴⁶ Cf. his *Stromata* (CPG 1377), book II, ch. 22.

Confessor.⁴⁸ John Damascene writes in the 26th chapter of his *De fide*: “τὸ μὲν γὰρ ‘κατ’ εἰκόνα’ τὸ νοερὸν δηλοῖ καὶ αὐτεξούσιον, τὸ δὲ ‘καθ’ οἰμοίωσιν’ τὴν τῆς ἀρετῆς κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν ὁμοίωσιν”, “the expression *in the image* refers to the rational and the autonomous, the expression *in the likeness* refers to the likeness achieved in the practising of virtue according to one’s ability”.⁴⁹

However, this distinction is lengthily described – as it is in the *Šestodnev* – in one of two *Homiliae de creatione hominis* (CPG 3215 and 3216), two homilies on the Creation sometimes considered to be the tenth and eleventh homily of Basil’s *Hexaemeron*, now attributed to Gregory and then again to Basil.⁵⁰ Accordingly we read in the first homily that we are indeed created in God’s image, but that the true likeness to God can only be repaired in us through our free will.⁵¹ Following is a short fragment⁵² that illustrates the parallel with John’s text:

Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ’ εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ’ οἰμοίωσιν. Τὸ μὲν τῇ κτίσει ἔχομεν, τὸ δὲ ἐκ προαιρέσεως κατορθοῦμεν. Ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ κατασκευῇ συνυπάρχει ἡμῖν τὸ κατ’ εἰκόνα γεγενῆσθαι Θεοῦ, ἐκ προαιρέσεως ἡμῖν κατορθοῦται τὸ καθ’ οἰμοίωσιν εἶναι Θεοῦ.

‘Créons l’Homme à notre image et à notre ressemblance’. Nous possédons l’un par la création, nous acquérons l’autre par la volonté. Dans la première structure, ik nous est

⁴⁷ Cf. his *De principiis* (CPG 1482), book III, chapter 6: “Now the fact that he said, ‘He made him in the image of God’, and was silent about the likeness, points to nothing else but this, that man received the honour of God’s image in his first creation, whereas the perfection of God’s likeness was reserved for him at the consummation. The purpose of this was that man should acquire it for himself by his own earnest efforts to imitate God, so that while the possibility of attaining perfection was given to him in the beginning through the honour of the ‘image’, he should in the end through the accomplishment of these works obtain for himself the perfect ‘likeness’.” G.W. BUTTERWORTH, *Origen On First Principles Being Koetschau’s Text of the ‘De Principiis’ Translated into English, Together with an Introduction and Notes*. New York 1966: 245. For the distinction between the ‘image’ and the ‘likeness’ see also his *Contra Celsum* (CPG 1476), IV,30 and his *In Epistulam Pauli ad Romanos* (CPG 1457), IV,5; for Origen’s theology of the image, see H. CROUZEL, *Théologie de l’image de Dieu chez Origène*. Aubier 1956.

⁴⁸ Cf. his *Capita de caritate* (CPG 7693), book III, ch. 25.

⁴⁹ KOTTER, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*: 76; See John the Exarch’s *Bogoslovie*, SADNIK, “Εκθεσις: 84: “їже бо по вѣрзюу то разумьно ксть и самовластьно авлаєть, а єже по подобью то нзволєнью добръ, протнвоу мощи, подобєннє сѧ.”

⁵⁰ Or *Homiliae In verba: Faciamus hominem*; Ed. PG 30: 37-61 and PG 44: 277-297; A. SMETS & M. VAN ESBROECK, *Basile de Césarée. Sur l’origine de l’homme (Hom. x et xi de l’Hexaéméron)*. Paris 1970; also H. HÖRNER, *Auctorum incertorum vulgo basilii vel gregorii nysseni Sermones de creatione hominis Sermo de paradiso*. Leiden 1972 (= *Gregorii Nysseni Opera Supplementum I*): 1-72.

⁵¹ For the distinction between εἰκών and ὁμοίωσις as an argument against the authorship of Gregory of Nyssa, cf. SMETS & VAN ESBROECK, *Basile de Césarée*: 24-25.

⁵² For the argument in full, see *op. cit.*: 204-209 (= HÖRNER, *Sermones de creatione hominis*: 27-31; PG 44: 272D-273B).

donné d'être nés à l'image de Dieu; par la volonté se forme en nous l'être à la ressemblance de Dieu.⁵³

The fact that these homilies were often handed down together with Basil's homilies on the Creation and Gregory's *De hominis opificio*, namely within a particular variant of the already mentioned 'Hexaemeron corpus',⁵⁴ makes it probable that the Exarch drew upon them for writing his *Šestodnev*. John's treatment of the distinction between 'image' and 'likeness' may perfectly well go back to the short formulation of John Damascene and the longish passage on this distinction in the first homily *De creatione hominis*.

There is, for that matter, another significant point of contact with the mentioned homilies, namely the argument concerning trinitarian implications in the scriptural passages Genesis 1:26 – "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness" – and Genesis 1:27 – "So God created man in his own image". In book VI of the *Šestodnev* the plural used in "let us make" and the singular of "God created" are brought in relation with the doctrine of the Trinity (11-20; 206d-207d):

НЪ ІЄГДА ХОТѢ ЧЛОВѢКА СЪТВОРИТИ, ТО СИЦЕ РЕЧЕ, СЪТВОРИМЪ ЧЛОВѢКА, ІЄДННО БОЖЬСТВО Н ТРИ СОБЪСТВА НАЗНАМЕНΟΥІА [...] ДА ТѢМЪ Н КЪДѢ Н СЪТВОРИ Н СЪВРЪШИ ДО КОНЬЦА, ТО ПАКЪ ПРІВЕДЪІ РЕЧЕ, Н СЪТВОРИ БОГЪ. ПО ОБРАЗУ БОЖІЮ СЪТВОРИ Н [...] ТРОИЦА БО ІЕСТЪ ІЄДННО, Н ІЄДННО ІЕСТЪ ТРОИЦА СОБЪСТВЪІ Н ІЄДННО ПАКЪ ІЕСТЬСТВОМЪ. (11-14, 206d-207a; 17-18, 207c)

The same argumentation is put forward rather extensively in the first homily *De creatione hominis* (§3-4) – a fragment:⁵⁵

Νῦν μέντοι "Ποιήσωμεν", ἵνα γνωρίσης Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν καὶ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον. "Ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον", ἵνα ἐνώσης τὴν θεότητα, ἐνώσης δὲ οὐ τὰς ὑποστάσεις ἀλλὰ τῇ δυνάμει, ἵνα μίαν δόξαν ἔχῃς μὴ μεριζόμενος περὶ τὴν προσκύνῃσιν, μὴ μεριζόμενος εἰς πολυθεΐαν.

Mais la parole 'Créons' est dite assurément pour que tu reconnaisse le Père, le Fils et l'Esprit-Saint. (La parole) 'Dieu créa l'Homme' (est dite) afin que tu conserves l'unité dans la divinité, sans conserver l'unité dans les hypostases, si ce n'est sous le rapport de la puissance, afin que tu rendes une gloire unique à Dieu sans faire de division dans l'adoration, division qui tournerait au polythéisme.⁵⁶

In this passage John anticipates a fragment at the end of Basil's ninth homily, which he translates further down in book VI and where a similar argumentation

⁵³ SMETS & VAN ESBROECK, *Basile de Césarée*: 206-207.

⁵⁴ Cf. *supra* note 18; viz. the so-called 'extended' or 'large corpus', see СЕЛЬС, *Славянский Корпус Гексамерона*: 620.

⁵⁵ For the argument in full, see SMETS & VAN ESBROECK, *Basile de Césarée*: 172-177 (= HÖRNER, *Sermones de creatione hominis*: 6-8; PG 44: 260C-260D).

⁵⁶ *Op. cit.*: 174-175.

is used.⁵⁷ However, John's treatment bears a striking resemblance with that of the homilies.

One may conclude that both similarities regarding the content as well as particulars concerning the Greek tradition confirm the possibility of influence of these homilies *De creatione hominis* on John's *Šestodnev*. However, on account of the fact that similar lines of argument occur with other patristic authors the hypothesis must be considered plausible but as yet unproven.

5. Conclusion

It is clear that John the Exarch did not only draw upon Basil's *Homiliae IX in Hexaemeron* to compile book VI of his *Šestodnev*, but that he also used other texts from the larger body of the 'Hexaemeron-corpus'. This dependence has been established for Gregory of Nyssa's anthropological treatise *De hominis opificio* and it is highly likely for the two homilies *De creatione hominis*.

The analysis of fragment VI, 85-150 (216a-224a) about the nature and the creation of body and soul illustrates the way in which the Exarch deals with his sources. The authority of a church father like Gregory of Nyssa does not cause him to flinch when he is convinced that the latter's opinions need to be criticized. Although John borrows from his source the broad frame of his exposition as well as particular arguments, he does reject or adopt the positions of his source within a cautiously built up argumentation of his own signature.

Many questions remain concerning the sources of the *Šestodnev* and the issue certainly retains its significance: every judgment over the Exarch's own voice, his viewpoints on theological matters, and his compilation art will remain premature without insight into the nature of his sources and the way he arranged and assimilated them.

⁵⁷ See AMAND DE MENDIETA & RUDBERG, *Basilii von Caesarea Homilien zum Hexaemeron*: 160 (= GIET: 519-520; PG 29: 205-208); cf. *Šestodnev* VI, 349-350; 249a.

APPENDIX

De hominis opificio

XXVIII.

(276) Κεφάλαιον κη. Πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας προὔφεστάναι τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν σωμάτων ἢ τὸ ἔμπαλιν πρὸ τῶν ψυχῶν διαπεπλάσθαι τὰ σώματα· ἐν ᾧ τις καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῆς κατὰ τὰς μετεμψυχώσεις μυθοποιῆας.

1. Τάχα γὰρ οὐκ ἔξω τῆς προκειμένης ἡμῖν πραγματείας ἐστὶ, τὸ διεξετάσαι τὸ ἀμφιβαλλόμενον ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις περὶ ψυχῆς τε καὶ σώματος. Τοῖς μὲν γὰρ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν δοκεῖ οἷς ὁ περὶ τῶν ἀρχῶν ἐπραγματεύθη λόγος, καθάπερ τινὰ δῆμον ἐν ἰδιαζούσῃ πολιτείᾳ τὰς ψυχὰς προὔφεστάναι λέγειν· προκεῖσθαι δὲ κάκεῖ τὰ τε τῆς κακίας καὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς ὑποδείγματα· καὶ παραμένουσιν μὲν ἐν τῷ καλῷ τὴν ψυχὴν, τῆς πρὸς τὸ σῶμα συμπλοκῆς μένιν ἀπείρατον· εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀπορρυῇ τῆς τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μετουσίας, πρὸς τὸν τῇδε βίον κατολισθαίνειν, καὶ οὕτως ἐν σώματι γίνεσθαι. Ἕτεροι δὲ τῇ κατὰ τὸν Μωϋσέα τάξει τῆς κατασκευῆς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου προσέχοντες, δευτέραν εἶναι τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ σώματος κατὰ τὸν χρόνον φασίν· ἐπειδὴ πρῶτον λαβὼν ὁ Θεὸς χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἔπλασεν, εἴθ' οὕτως ἐψύχωσε διὰ τοῦ ἐμφυσήματος· καὶ τούτῳ τῷ λόγῳ προτιμότεραν ἀποδεικνύουσι τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν σάρκα, τῆς ἐπεισκρινομένης τὴν προδιαπεπλασμένην· λέγουσι γὰρ διὰ τὸ σῶμα τὴν ψυχὴν γενέσθαι, ὡς ἂν μὴ ἄπνουν τε καὶ ἀκίνητον εἴη τὸ πλάσμα· πᾶν δὲ τὸ διὰ τι γινόμενον, ἀτιμότερον πάντως ἐστὶ τοῦ δι' ὃ γίνεται, καθὼς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον λέγει ὅτι πλεῖόν ἐστι τῆς τροφῆς ἢ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος, διότι τούτων ἕνεκεν ἐκεῖνα – οὐ γὰρ διὰ τὴν τροφήν ἢ ψυχὴ οὐδὲ τοῦ ἐνδύματος χάριν κατεσκευάσθη τὰ σώματα, ἀλλὰ, τούτων ὄντων, ἐκεῖνα διὰ τὴν χρείαν προσεξηρῆθη. (278)

2. Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἐν ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς ὑπολήψεσιν ὁ λόγος ὑπαίτιος, τῶν τε προβιοτεύειν τὰς ψυχὰς ἐν ἰδίᾳ τινὶ καταστάσει μυθολογούντων καὶ τῶν ὑστέρας τῶν σωμάτων κατασκευάζεσθαι νομιζόντων, ἀναγκαῖον ἂν εἴη μηδὲν τῶν ἐν τοῖς δόγμασι λεγομένων περιιδεῖν ἀνεξέταστον. ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν δι' ἀκριβείας τοὺς ἐκατέρωθεν γυμνάζειν λόγους καὶ πάσας ἐκκαλύπτειν τὰς ἐγκειμένας ἀτοπίας ταῖς ὑπολήψεσι, μακροῦ ἂν δέοιτο καὶ λόγου καὶ χρόνου; δι' ὀλίγων δὲ, καθὼς ἐστὶ δυνατόν, ἐκάτερον τῶν εἰρημένων ἐπισκεψάμενοι, πάλιν τῶν προκειμένων ἀντιληψόμεθα.

3. Οἱ τῷ προτέρῳ παριστάμενοι λόγῳ καὶ πρεσβυτέραν τῆς ἐν σαρκὶ ζωῆς τὴν πολιτείαν τῶν ψυχῶν δογματίζοντες, οὐ μοι δοκοῦσι τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν καθαρεύειν δογμάτων τῶν περὶ τῆς μετενσωματώσεως αὐτοῖς μεμυθολογημένων· εἰ γὰρ τις ἀκριβῶς ἐξετάσειε, πρὸς τοῦτο κατὰ πᾶσαν ἀνάγκην τὸν λόγον αὐτοῖς εὐρήσει κατασυρόμενον. Φασὶ τίνα τῶν παρ' ἐκείνοις σοφῶν εἰρηκέναι, ὅτι ἀνὴρ γέγονεν ὁ αὐτὸς, καὶ γυναικὸς σῶμα μετημφιάσατο, καὶ μετ' ὀρνέων ἀνέπτῃ, καὶ θάμνος ἔφυ, καὶ τὸν ἔνυδρον ἔλαχε βίον – οὐ πόρρω τῆς ἀληθείας, κατὰ γε τὴν ἐμὴν κρίσιν, φερόμενος ὁ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ ταῦτα λέγων· ὄντως γὰρ βατράχων τινῶν ἢ κολοιῶν φλυαρίας ἢ ἀλογίας ἰχθύων ἢ δρυῶν ἀναισθησίας ἄξια τὰ τοιαῦτα δόγματα, τὸ μίαν ψυχὴν λέγειν διὰ τοσούτων ἐλθεῖν.

4. Τῆς δὲ τοιαύτης ἀτοπίας αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ αἰτία, τὸ προὔφεστάναι τὰς ψυχὰς οἶεσθαι· δι' ἀκολούθου γὰρ ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῦ τοιούτου δόγματος ἐπὶ τὸ προσεχές τε καὶ παρακείμενον τὸν λόγον προάγουσα, μέχρι τούτου τερατευομένη διέξεισιν· εἰ γὰρ διὰ τίνος κακίας ἀποσπασθεῖσα τῆς ὑψηλοτέρας ἢ ψυχῆς πολιτείας, μετὰ τὸ (καθὼς φασιν) ἅπαξ γεύσασθαι τοῦ σωματικοῦ βίου πάλιν ἄνθρωπος γίνεται· ἐμπαθέστερος δὲ πάντως ὁ ἐν σαρκὶ βίος ὁμολογεῖται παρὰ τὸν αἰδῖον καὶ ἀσώματον· (280) ἀνάγκη πᾶσα, τὴν ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ γενομένην βίῳ ἐν ᾧ πλείους αἱ πρὸς τὸ ἁμαρτάνειν εἰσὶν ἀφορμαί, ἐν πλείονί τε κακία γενέσθαι καὶ ἐμπαθέστερον ἢ πρότερον διατεθῆναι· ἀνθρωπίνης δὲ ψυχῆς πάθος, ἢ πρὸς τὸ ἄλογόν ἐστιν ὁμοίωσις· τούτῳ

δὲ προσοικειωθεῖσαν αὐτήν, εἰς κτηνώδη φύσιν μεταρρῦναι· ἅπαξ δὲ διὰ κακίας ὀδεύουσιν, μηδὲ ἐν ἀλόγῳ γενομένην τῆς ἐπὶ τὸ κακὸν προόδου λήξαι ποτε· ἡ γὰρ τοῦ κακοῦ στάσις ἀρχὴ τῆς κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐστὶν ὁρμῆς· ἀρετὴ δὲ ἐν ἀλόγοις οὐκ ἔστιν· οὐκοῦν αἰεὶ πρὸς τὸ χεῖρον ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἀλλοιωθήσεται, πάντοτε πρὸς τὸ ἀτιμότερον προϊούσα καὶ αἰεὶ τὸ χεῖρον τῆς ἐν ἧ ἔστι φύσεως ἐξευρίσκουσα· ὥσπερ δὲ τοῦ λογικοῦ τὸ αἰσθητὸν ὑποβέβηκεν, οὕτω καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου ἐπὶ τὸ ἀναίσθητον ἢ μετάπτωσις γίνεται.

5. Ἀλλὰ μέχρι τούτου προῖων ὁ λόγος αὐτοῖς, εἰ καὶ ἔξω τῆς ἀληθείας φέρεται, ἀλλὰ γε διὰ τινος ἀκολουθίας τὸ ἄτοπον ἐξ ἀτόπου μεταλαμβάνει· τὸ δὲ ἐντεῦθεν ἤδη διὰ τῶν ἀσυναρτήτων αὐτοῖς τὸ δόγμα μυθοποιεῖται. ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἀκολουθία παντελῇ διαφθορὰν τῆς ψυχῆς ὑποδείκνυσιν· ἡ γὰρ ἅπαξ τῆς ὑψηλῆς πολιτείας ἀπολισθήσασα, ἐν οὐδενὶ μέτρῳ κακίας στήναι δυνήσεται, ἀλλὰ, διὰ τῆς πρὸς τὰ πάθη σχέσεως, ἀπὸ μὲν τοῦ λογικοῦ πρὸς τὸ ἄλογον μεταβήσεται· ἀπ' ἐκείνου δὲ πρὸς τὴν τῶν φυτῶν ἀναισθησίαν μετατεθήσεται· τῷ δὲ ἀναισθητῷ γειτνιά πῶς τὸ ἄψυχον· τούτῳ δὲ τὸ ἀνύπαρκτον ἔπεται· ὥστε καθόλου διὰ τῆς ἀκολουθίας πρὸς τὸ μὴ ὄν αὐτοῖς ἡ ψυχὴ μεταχωρήσει· οὐκοῦν ἀμήχανος αὐτῇ πάλιν ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἔσται ἢ πρὸς τὸ κρεῖττον ἐπάνοδος ἀλλὰ μὴν ἐκ θάμνου ἐπὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον τὴν ψυχὴν ἐπανάγουσιν. οὐκοῦν προτιμότεραν τὴν ἐν θάμνῳ ζῶν τῆς ἀσωμάτου διαγωγῆς ἐκ τούτων ἀποδεικνύουσι.

6. Δέδεικται γὰρ, ὅτι ἡ πρὸς τὸ χεῖρον γενομένη πρόοδος τῆς ψυχῆς, πρὸς τὸ κατώτερον κατὰ τὸ εἶδος ὑποβήσεται. ὑποβέβηκε δὲ τὴν ἀναίσθητον φύσιν τὸ ἄψυχον, εἰς ὃ δι' ἀκο(282)λουθίας ἢ ἀρχὴ τοῦ δόγματος αὐτῶν τὴν ψυχὴν ἄγει· ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ τοῦτο οὐ βούλονται· ἢ τῷ ἀναισθητῷ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐγκατακλείουσιν, ἢ εἴπερ ἐντεῦθεν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀνθρώπινον αὐτὴν ἐπανάγοιεν βίον, προτιμότερον (καθὼς εἴρηται) τὸν ξυλῶδη βίον τῆς πρώτης ἀποδείξουσι καταστάσεως, εἴπερ ἐκεῖθεν μὲν ἢ πρὸς κακίαν κατάπτωσις γέγονεν, ἐντεῦθεν δὲ ἢ πρὸς ἀρετὴν ἐπάνοδος γίνεται.

7. Οὐκοῦν ἀκέφαλός τις καὶ ἀτελής ὁ τοιοῦτος διελέγχεται λόγος, ὁ τὰς ψυχὰς ἐφ' ἑαυτῶν πρὸ τῆς ἐν σαρκὶ ζωῆς βιοτεύειν κατασκευάζων καὶ διὰ κακίας συνδεῖσθαι τοῖς σώμασι· τῶν δέ γε νεωτέραν τοῦ σώματος τὴν ψυχὴν εἶναι λεγόντων, προκατεσκευάσθη διὰ τῶν κατόπιν ἢ ἀτοπία.

8. Οὐκοῦν ἀπόβλητος ἐπίσης ὁ παρ' ἀμφοτέρων λόγος· διὰ δὲ τοῦ μέσου τῶν ὑπολήψεων εὐθύνειν οἶμαι δεῖν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ τὸ ἡμέτερον δόγμα· ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο, τὸ μήτε κατὰ τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν ἀπάτην ἐν κακίᾳ τινὶ βαρηθείσας τὰς τῷ παντὶ συμπεριπολούσας ψυχὰς, ἀδυναμία τοῦ συμπαραθέειν τῇ ὀξύτητι τῆς τοῦ πόλου κινήσεως ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καταπίπτειν οἶεσθαι·

XXIX.

Κεφάλαιον κθ. Κατασκευὴ τοῦ μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ψυχὴν τε καὶ σώματι τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς ὑπάρξεως εἶναι.

Μηδ' αὖ πάλιν οἶονεὶ πῆλινον ἀνδριάντα προδιαπλάσαντας τῷ λόγῳ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, τούτου ἔνεκεν τὴν ψυχὴν γίνεσθαι λέγειν. ἡ γὰρ ἂν ἀτιμότερα τοῦ πηλίνου πλάσματος ἢ νοερὰ φύσις ἀποδειχθεῖη. ἀλλ' ἐνὸς ὄντος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τοῦ διὰ ψυχῆς τε καὶ σώματος συνεστηκότος, μίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ κοινὴν τῆς συστάσεως τὴν ἀρχὴν ὑποτίθεσθαι, ὥς ἂν μὴ αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ προγενέστερός τε καὶ νεώτερος γένοιτο, τοῦ μὲν σωματικοῦ προτερεύοντος ἐν (284) αὐτῷ, τοῦ δὲ ἐτέρου ἐφυστερίζοντος· ἀλλὰ τῇ μὲν προγνωστικῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ δυνάμει (κατὰ τὸν μικρῷ πρόσθεν ἀποδοθέντα λόγον) ἅπαν προῦφεστάναι τὸ ἀνθρώπινον πλήρωμα λέγειν, συμμαρτυρούσης εἰς τοῦτο τῆς προφητείας τῆς λεγούσης, εἰδέναι τὰ πάντα τὸν Θεὸν πρὶν γενέσεως αὐτῶν· ἐν δὲ τῇ καθ' ἑκάστον δημιουργίᾳ μὴ προτιθέναι τοῦ ἐτέρου τὸ ἕτερον, μήτε πρὸ τοῦ σώματος τὴν ψυχὴν, μήτε τὸ ἔμπαλιν· ὥς ἂν μὴ στασιάζοι πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῇ κατὰ τὸν χρόνον διαφορᾷ μεριζόμενος.

2. Διπλῆς γὰρ τῆς φύσεως ἡμῶν νοουμένης, κατὰ τὴν ἀποστολικὴν διδασκαλίαν, τοῦ τε φαινομένου ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ κεκρυμμένου· εἰ τὸ μὲν προϋπάρχει τὸ δὲ ἐπιγένοιτο, ἀτελὲς τις ἢ τοῦ Δημιουργοῦντος ἀπελεγχθήσεται δύναμις, οὐ τῷ παντὶ κατὰ τὸ ἀθρόον ἐξαρκούσα, ἀλλὰ διαιρουμένη τὸ ἔργον καὶ ἀνὰ μέρος περὶ ἑκάτερον τῶν ἡμισευμάτων ἀσχολουμένη.

3. Ἄλλ' ὥσπερ ἐν τῷ σίτῳ φαμέν ἢ ἐν ἐτέρῳ τινὶ τῶν σπερμάτων, ἅπαν ἐμπεριελήφθαι τῇ δυνάμει τὸ κατὰ τὸν στάχυν εἶδος, τὸν χόρτον, τὴν καλάμην, τὰς διὰ μέσου ζώνας, τὸν καρπὸν, τοὺς ἀνθέρικας, καὶ οὐδὲν τούτων ἐν τῷ τῆς φύσεως λόγῳ προϋπάρχειν ἢ προγίνεσθαι φαμέν τῇ φύσει τοῦ σπέρματος, ἀλλὰ τάξει μὲν τινι φυσικῇ τὴν ἐγκειμένην τῷ σπέρματι δύναμιν φανεροῦσθαι, οὐ μὴν ἐτέραν ἐπεισκρίνεσθαι φύσιν – κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον καὶ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην σπορὰν ἔχειν ὑπειλήφαμεν, ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τῆς συστάσεως ἀφορμῇ συνεσπαρμένην τὴν τῆς φύσεως δύναμιν· ἐξαπλοῦσθαι δὲ καὶ φανεροῦσθαι διὰ τινος φυσικῆς ἀκολουθίας πρὸς τὸ τέλειον προϊούσαν, οὐ προσλαμβάνουσάν τι τῶν ἔξωθεν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τελειώσεως· ἀλλ' ἐαυτὴν εἰς τὸ τέλειον δι' ἀκολουθίας προάγουσαν· ὥς μήτε ψυχὴν πρὸ τοῦ σώματος μήτε χωρὶς ψυχῆς τὸ σῶμα ἀληθὲς εἶναι λέγειν, ἀλλὰ μίαν ἀμφοτέρων ἀρχὴν, κατὰ μὲν τὸν ὑψηλότερον λόγον, ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ (286) βουλήματι καταβληθεῖσαν, κατὰ δὲ τὸν ἕτερον, ἐν ταῖς τῆς γενέσεως ἀφορμαῖς συνισταμένην.

4. Ὡς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι τὴν κατὰ τὰ μέλη διάρθρωσιν ἐνιδεῖν τῷ πρὸς τὴν σύλληψιν τοῦ σώματος ἐντιθεμένῳ πρὸ τῆς διαπλάσεως· οὕτως οὐδὲ τὰς τῆς ψυχῆς ιδιότητας ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ δυνατόν ἐστι κατανοῆσαι, πρὶν προελθεῖν εἰς ἐνέργειαν· καὶ ὥσπερ οὐκ ἂν τις ἀμφιβάλοι πρὸς τὰς τῶν ἄρθρων τε καὶ σπλάγχνων διαφορὰς ἐκεῖνο τὸ ἐντεθὲν σχηματίζεσθαι, οὐκ ἄλλης τινὸς δυνάμεως ἐπείσερχομένης, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐγκειμένης φυσικῶς πρὸς τὴν ἐνέργειαν ταύτην μεθισταμένης· οὕτω καὶ περὶ ψυχῆς ἀναλόγως ἐστὶ τὸ ἴσον ὑπονοῆσαι, ὅτι καὶ μὴ διὰ τινων ἐνεργειῶν ἐν τῷ φαινομένῳ γνωρίζεται, οὐδὲν ἥττον ἐστὶν ἐν ἐκείνῳ· καὶ γὰρ καὶ τὸ εἶδος τοῦ μέλλοντος συνίστασθαι ἀνθρώπου ἐν ἐκείνῳ ἐστὶ τῇ δυνάμει, λανθάνει δὲ διὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι δυνατόν πρὸ τῆς ἀναγκαίας ἀκολουθίας ἀναφανῆναι· οὕτω καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ, ἔστι μὲν ἐν ἐκείνῳ καὶ μὴ φαινομένη, φανήσεται δὲ διὰ τῆς οἰκείας ἐαυτῆς καὶ κατὰ φύσιν ἐνεργείας, τῇ σωματικῇ αὐξήσει συμπεριούσα.

5. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ οὐκ ἀπὸ νεκροῦ σώματος ἢ πρὸς τὴν σύλληψιν δύναμις ἀποκρίνεται ἀλλ' ἐξ ἐμψύχου καὶ ζῶντος· διὰ τοῦτό φαμέν εὐλογον εἶναι μὴ νεκρὸν καὶ ἄψυχον οἶεσθαι τὸ ἀπὸ ζῶντος εἰς ζωῆς ἀφορμὴν προϊέμενον· τὸ γὰρ ἐν σαρκὶ ἄψυχον, καὶ νεκρὸν ἐστὶ πάντως· ἡ δὲ νεκρότης κατὰ στέρησιν ψυχῆς γίνεται· οὐκ ἂν δέ τις ἐπὶ τούτου πρεσβύτεραν τῆς ἔξεως εἴποι τὴν στέρησιν, εἴπερ τὸ ἄψυχον, ὅπερ νεκρότης ἐστὶ, τῆς ψυχῆς εἶναι τις κατασκευάζει πρεσβύτερον· εἰ δέ τις καὶ ἐναργέστερον ζητοίῃ τεκμήριον τοῦ ζῆν ἐκεῖνο τὸ μέρος ὅπερ ἀρχὴ τοῦ κατασκευαζομένου γίνεται ζώου, δυνατόν ἐστι καὶ δι' ἄλλων σημείων δι' ὧν τὸ ἐμψυχον ἐκ τοῦ νεκροῦ διακρίνεται, καὶ περὶ τούτου κατανοῆσαι· τεκμήριον γὰρ τοῦ ζῆν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ποιούμεθα, τὸ θερμὸν εἶναι τινα καὶ ἐνεργὸν καὶ (288) κινούμενον· τὸ δὲ κατεψυγμένον τε καὶ ἀκίνητον ἐπὶ τῶν σωμάτων, οὐδὲν ἕτερον εἰ μὴ νεκρότης ἐστίν.

6. Ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν ἔνθερμόν τε καὶ ἐνεργὸν θεωροῦμεν τοῦτο περὶ οὗ τὸν λόγον ποιούμεθα, τὸ μὴδὲ ἄψυχον εἶναι διὰ τούτων συντεκμαιρόμεθα· ἀλλ' ὥσπερ κατὰ τὸ σωματικὸν αὐτοῦ μέρος, οὐ σάρκα φαμέν αὐτὸ καὶ ὀστέα καὶ τρίχας καὶ ὅσα περὶ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον καθορᾶται, ἀλλὰ τῇ δυνάμει μὲν εἶναι τούτων ἕκαστον, οὕτω δὲ κατὰ τὸ ὁρώμενον φαίνεσθαι· οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ψυχικοῦ μέρους, οὕτω μὲν τὸ λογικὸν καὶ ἐπιθυμητικὸν καὶ θυμοειδὲς καὶ ὅσα περὶ ψυχὴν καθορᾶται, καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῳ χώραν ἔχειν φαμέν, ἀναλόγως δὲ τῆς τοῦ σώματος κατασκευῆς τε καὶ τελειώσεως, καὶ τὰς τῆς ψυχῆς ἐνεργείας τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ συναύξεσθαι.

7. Ὡς περὶ γὰρ τελειωθείς ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ἐν τοῖς μείζουσιν ἔχει διαφαινομένην τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν ἐνέργειαν· οὕτως ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς συστάσεως τὴν κατάλληλόν τε καὶ σύμμετρον τῇ παρουσίᾳ χρεια συνέργειαν τῆς ψυχῆς ἐφ' ἐαυτοῦ διαδείκνυσιν, ἐν τῷ κατασκευάζειν αὐτὴν ἐαυτῇ διὰ τῆς ἐν-

τεθείσης ὕλης τὸ προσφυὲς οἰκητήριον· οὐδὲ γὰρ εἶναι δυνατόν λογιζόμεθα, ἀλλοτρίαις οἰκοδομαῖς τὴν ψυχὴν ἐναρμόζεσθαι, ὥς οὐκ ἔστι τὴν ἐν τῷ κηρῷ σφραγίδα πρὸς ἀλλοτρίαν ἀρμοσθῆναι γλυφῇν.

8. Καθάπερ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα ἐκ βραχυτάτου πρὸς τὸ τέλειον πρόεισιν, οὕτω καὶ ἡ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐνέργεια καταλλήλως ἐμφυομένη τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ, συνεπιδίδωσι καὶ συναύξεται· προηγείται μὲν γὰρ αὐτῆς ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ κατασκευῇ οἷον ρίζης τινὸς ἐν τῇ γῇ κατακρυφθείσης ἢ αὐξητική τε καὶ θρεπτική δύναμις μόνη· οὐ γὰρ χωρεῖ τὸ περισσότερον ἢ τοῦ δεχομένου βραχύτης· εἶτα, προελθόντος εἰς φῶς τοῦ φυτοῦ καὶ ἡλίῳ τὴν βλάστην δείξαντος, ἢ αἰσθητικῇ χάρις ἐπήνθησεν· ἀδρυνθέντος δὲ ἤδη καὶ εἰς σύμμετρον μήκος ἀναδραμόντος, καθάπερ τις καρπὸς διαλάμπειν ἢ λογικῇ δύναμις ἄρχεται, οὐ πᾶσα ἀθρόως ἐκφαινομένη, ἀλλὰ (290) τῇ τοῦ ὀργάνου τελειώσει δι' ἐπιμελείας συναύξουσα, τοσοῦτον ἀεὶ καρποφοροῦσα ὅσον χωρεῖ τοῦ ὑποκειμένου ἢ δύναμις.

9. Εἰ δὲ ζητεῖς ἐν τῇ τοῦ σώματος πλάσει τὰς ψυχικὰς ἐνεργείας, πρόσεχε σεαυτῷ, φησὶ Μωϋσῆς, καὶ ἀναγνώσῃ καθάπερ ἐν βίβλῳ τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς ἔργων τὴν ἱστορίαν· αὐτὴ γάρ σοι διηγείται ἢ φύσις, λόγου παντὸς ἐναργέστερον, τὰς ποικίλας ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς ψυχῆς ἀσχολίας ἐν τε ταῖς καθόλου καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἐπὶ μέρους κατασκευαῖς.

10. Ἀλλὰ περιττὸν οἶμαι λόγῳ τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς διεξιέναι, καθάπερ τι τῶν ὑπερορίων διηγούμενους θαυμάτων· τίς γὰρ ἑαυτὸν βλέπων, λόγῳ δεῖται τὴν οἰκείαν φύσιν διδάσκεσθαι; δυνατόν γάρ ἐστι, τὸν τῆς ζωῆς τρόπον κατανοήσαντα καὶ ὥς πρὸς πᾶσαν ζωτικὴν ἐνέργειαν ἐπιτηδεύς ἔχει τὸ σῶμα καταμαθόντα, γινῶναι περὶ τί κατησχολήθη τὸ φυσικὸν τῆς ψυχῆς παρὰ τὴν πρώτην τοῦ γινομένου διάπλασιν· ὥστε καὶ διὰ τούτου φανερόν εἶναι τοῖς οὐκ ἀνεπισκέπτοις, τὸ μὴ νεκρόν τε καὶ ἄψυχον ἐν τῷ ἐργαστηρίῳ γενέσθαι τῆς φύσεως ὃ πρὸς τὴν τοῦ ζώου φυτείαν ἐκ τοῦ ζώντος σώματος ἀποσπασθὲν ἐνετέθη.

11. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ τῶν καρπῶν τὰς ἐντεριώνας καὶ τὰς τῶν ριζῶν ἀποσπάδας οὐ νεκρωθείσας τῆς ἐγκειμένης τῇ φύσει ζωτικῆς δυνάμεως τῇ γῇ καταβάλλομεν, ἀλλὰ συντηρούσας ἐν ἑαυταῖς, κεκρυμμένην μὲν ζῶσαν δὲ πάντως, τοῦ πρωτοτύπου τὴν ιδιότητα· τὴν δὲ τοιαύτην δύναμιν οὐκ ἐντίθησιν ἢ περιέχουσα γῇ ἔξωθεν παρ' ἑαυτῆς ἐπείσκειν οὐσα – ἢ γὰρ ἂν καὶ τὰ νεκρὰ τῶν ξύλων εἰς βλάστην προήγετο – ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐγκειμένην ἔκδηλον ἀπεργάζεται, διὰ τῆς οἰκείας ἱκμάδος τιθηνουμένη, εἰς ρίζαν καὶ φλοιὸν καὶ ἐντεριώνην καὶ τὰς τῶν κλάδων ἐκφύσεις τὸ φυτὸν τελειοῦσα· ὅπερ οὐχ οἷόν τε ἦν γίνεσθαι, μή τινος φυσικῆς δυνάμεως συνεντεθείσης, ἥτις τὴν συγγενῇ καὶ κατάλληλον ἐκ τῶν παρακειμένων τροφὴν εἰς ἑαυτὴν ἔλκουσα, θάμνος ἢ δένδρον ἢ στάχυς ἢ τι τῶν φρυγανικῶν βλαστημάτων ἐγένετο.

LITERATURE CITED

- AITZETMÜLLER, R., *Das Hexaëmeron des Exarchen Johannes*. Bd I-VII. Graz 1958-1975 (in the series: *Editiones monumentorum slavicornum veteris dialecti*).
- ALTENBURGER, M. & F. MANN, *Bibliographie zu Gregor von Nyssa. Editionen – Übersetzungen – Literatur*. Leiden – New York – København – Köln 1988.
- AMAND DE MENDIETA, E. & S.Y. RUDBERG, *Basile de Césarée. La tradition manuscrite directe des neuf homélies sur l'Hexaéméron. Étude philologique* (= *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*. Bd. 123). Berlin 1980.
- AMAND DE MENDIETA, E. & S.Y. RUDBERG, *Basilios von Caesarea Homilien zum Hexaemeron*. Berlin 1997 (= *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte*. Neue Folge – Bd 2).
- BONWETSCH, G.N., *Methodius Olympius, Werke*. Leipzig 1917 (= *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte* 27).
- BUTTERWORTH, G.W., *Origen On First Principles Being Koetschau's Text of the 'De Principiis' Translated into English, Together with an Introduction and Notes*. New York 1966.
- CANIVET, P., *Théodoret de Cyr – Thérapeutique des maladies helléniques*; t.I. Livres I-VI; t.II Livres VII-XII. Paris 1958 (= *Sources chrétiennes* 57/1-2).
- H. CROUZEL, *Théologie de l'image de Dieu chez Origène*. Aubier 1956 (= *Études publiées de la faculté de théologie S.J. de Lyon-Fourvière* 34).
- DANIÉLOU, J., "L'apocatastase chez Grégoire de Nysse", *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 30 (1940): 328-347.
- DUJČEV, I., "L'Hexaéméron de Jean l'Exarque", *Byzantino-Slavica* 39 (1978): 209-233.
- DUJČEV, I., "Zur Biographie von Johannes dem Exarchen", *Litterae slavicae medii aevi: Francisco Venceslao Mareš Sexagenario Oblatae*. Ed. Johannes Reinhart. München 1985 (= *Sagner's Slavistische Sammlung* 8): 67-72.
- FORBES, G.H., *Sancti patris nostri Gregorii Nysseni Basilii Magni fratris quae supersunt omnia*. T.1, fasc. 1-2. Burntisland 1855.
- GEERARD, M., *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* I-IV. Turnhout 1974-1983 (in the series *Corpus Christianorum*). [= CPG]
- GEERARD, M. & J. NORET, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum. Supplementum*. Turnhout 1998 (in the series *Corpus Christianorum*).
- GIET, S., *Basile de Césarée. Homélies sur l'Hexaéméron*. Paris 1949 (= *Sources Chrétiennes* 26).
- GÖRGEMANNS, H. & H. KARPP, *Vier Bücher von den Prinzipien, herausgegeben, übersetzt, mit kritischen und erläuternden Anmerkungen versehen*. Darmstadt 1976 (= *Texte zur Forschung* 24).
- GRONAU, K., *Poseidonius und die jüdisch- christliche Genesisexegese*. Leipzig/Berlin 1914.
- HÖRNER, H., *Auctorum incertorum vulgo basilii vel gregorii nysseni Sermones de creatione hominis Sermo de paradiso*. Leiden 1972 (= *Gregorii Nysseni Opera Supplementum* I).
- IL'ISKIJ, G.A., "Jean l'Exarch. À propos du livre de Kalajdovič (1824-1924)", *Revue des Études Slaves* 4 (1924): 199-207.
- KOETSCHAU, P., *Origenes Werke V. De principiis*. Leipzig 1913 (= *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte* 22).
- KOTTER, P.B., *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos II.* Ἐκδοσις ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως. *Expositio fidei*. Berlin – New York 1973 (= *Patristische Texte und Studien* 12).
- KRUMBACHER, K., *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur : von Justinian bis zum Ende des Oströmischen Reiches (527-1453)*. Zweite Auflage, bearbeitet unter Mitwirkung von A.

Ehrhard und H. Gelzer. New York 1958 (München 1897) (= *Burt Franklin Bibliographical Series* 8).

LAPLACE, J. & J. DANIELOU, *Grégoire de Nysse. La création de l'homme*. Réimpression de la première édition revue et corrigée. Paris 2002 (1943) (= *Sources Chrétiennes* 6).

LESKIEN, A., "Zum Šestodnev des Exarchen Johannes", *Archiv für Slavische Philologie* 26 (1904): 1-70.

LESKIEN, A., "Der aristotelische Abschnitt im Hexaemeron des Exarchen Johannes", *Jagič-Festschrift. Zbornik u slavu Vatroslava Jagića*. Berlin 1908: 97-111.

MIGNE, J.-P. (ed.), *Patrologiae cursus completus [...]. Series prima [...]*. Paris 1844-1865. [= PG]

MOORE, W & H.A. WILSON, *Select Writings and Letters of Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa*. Oxford – New York 1893 (reprint: Grand Rapids, Michigan 1994) (= *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. Second Series*. Ed. Ph. Schaff and H. Wace. Vol. V. *Gregory of Nyssa : dogmatic treatises etc.*).

PATTERSON, L.G., *The Anti-Origenist Theologie of Methodius of Olympus*. Columbia University 1958 (Ph.D. Thesis).

PODSKALSKY, G., "Ruhestand oder Vollendung? Zur Symbolik des achten Tages in der griechisch-byzantinischen Theologie", *Fest und Alltag in Byzanz*, ed. G. Prinzing & D. Simon. München 1990: 157-166, 216-219.

PODSKALSKY, G., *Theologische Literatur des Mittelalters in Bulgarien und Serbien 865-1459*. München 2000.

SADNIK, L., *Des hl. Johannes von Damaskus* "Εκθεσις ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως in der Übersetzung des Exarchen Johannes. Bd 1, Wiesbaden 1967. Bd 2-4, Freiburg i. Br. 1981-1984 (= *Monumenta linguae slavicae dialecti veteris. Fontes et dissertationes* 5, 14, 16, 17).

SADNIK, L., "Die Bruchstücke aus Väterschriften im Anschluß an die Übersetzung der "Εκθεσις ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως des Exarchen Johannes", *Anzeiger für slavische Philologie* 9 (1977), 2: 429-444; 10-11 (1979): 163-187; 12 (1981): 133-169.

SMETS, A. & M. VAN ESBROECK, *Basile de Césarée. Sur l'origine de l'homme (Hom. x et xi de l'Hexaéméron)*. Paris 1970 (= *Sources chrétiennes* 160).

STEPHANOU, E., "La coexistence initiale du corps et de l'âme, d'après saint Grégoire de Nysse", *Echos d'Orient* 331 (1932): 304-315.

J. ZELLINGER, *Die Genesishomilien des Bischofs Severian von Gabala*. Münster 1916 (= *Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen* VII,1).

БАРАНКОВА, Г.С., *Шестоднев Иоанна Екзарха Болгарского. Ранняя Русская редакция*. Москва 1998.

БАРАНКОВА, Г. & В. МИЛЬКОВ, *Шестоднев Иоанна Екзарха Болгарского*. Санкт-Петербург 2001 (= *Памятники древнерусской мысли: исследования и тексты*. Вып. II).

ГОРСКИЙ, А.В. & К.И. НЕВОСТРУЕВ, *Описание славянских рукописей Московской синодальной библиотеки*. II.2. Москва 1857.

СЕЛЬС, Л. (= L. SELS), "Славянский 'Корпус Гексамерона': Перевод 14-го века и Иоанн Экзарх Болгарский", *Проблеми на Кирило-Методиевото дело и на Българска култура през XIV век*. София 2007 (= *Кирило-Методиевски студии* 17): 619-626.

ТРИФОНОВ, Ю., "Иоан Екзарх Български и неговото описание на човешкото тело", *Български преглед* 1 (1929), кн. 2: 165-202.

РЕЗЮМЕ

Можно смело утверждать, что *Шестоднев* Иоанна Экзарха является одним из величайших достижений старославянской литературы эпохи царя Симеона. Хотя в науке, особенно после выхода издания Айцетмюллера (Graz 1958-1975), этому экзегетическому произведению Иоанна уделяется достаточно много внимания, сравнительно мало работ было посвящено византийским прототипам. Кроме частей текста, которые напрямую связаны с основными первоисточниками Экзарха – *Беседы на Шестоднев* (или *Гексамерон*) Василия Кесарийского (CPG 4194), *Беседы о творении мира* Северина Габальского (CPG 4194) и, в случае с первым ‘Словом’, с трактатом Феодорита Кирского *Излечение эллинских недугов* (CPG 6210) – в *Шестодневе* встречаются длинные фрагменты, которые до сих пор не были сопоставлены с греческими параллельными текстами.

Один из таких фрагментов представляет собой часть шестого ‘Слова’, посвященной созданию Человека. Целью данного исследования является проведение критического анализа греческих источников для этого фрагмента *Шестоднева* (Айцетмюллер: VI, 85-150), опираясь на греческую традицию так называемого ‘корпуса *Гексамерона*’ – собрание текстов, сгруппированных вокруг *Бесед о творении мира* Василия, которые включают работу Григория Нисского *Об устройении человека* (CPG 3154). Доказывается, что антропологический трактат Григория стал важным источником для написания шестого ‘Слова’ Иоанна Экзарха, несмотря на подозрения о присутствии в нем элементов ереси. Предположения Иоанна об еретической направленности текста Григория объясняют осторожное отношение к этому источнику. Кроме того, в целях лучшего понимания композиции шестого ‘Слова’, да и *Шестоднева* в целом, анализ затрагивает и прочие возможные патристические источники.